The Nation

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1916.

Summary of the News

Unexpectedly came the news on Friday of last week that on the afternoon of May 31 and the following night had taken place a great naval battle in the North Sea off the coast of Jutland, between Skagerak and Horn Riff. The first announcement of the engagement came in the form of an official statement from Berlin, which declared that the German high sea fleet had encountered "the main part of the English fighting fleet, which was considerably superior to our forces," and that the engagement "was successful to us." An enumeration of the losses on either side seemed to bear out the German claim to victory, which apparently received further confirmation from the earliest meagre statement of the British Admiralty, also published on Friday.

Later statements of the British Admiralty throw a rather different light on the result of the engagement. A communication issued on Saturday declared explicitly that, among other losses, in addition to those admitted by Germany, a Dreadnought battleship of the Kaiser class and a battle-cruiser were "blown up," while other capital ships were believed to have been sunk. A subsequent statement said: "There seems to be the strongest ground for supposing that included in the German losses are two battleships; two Dreadnought battle-cruisers of the most powerful type; two of the latest light cruisers, the Wiesbaden and the Elbing; a light cruiser of the Rostock type; the light cruiser Frauenlob; nine destroyers, and a submarine." The losses officially admitted by Germany are one battleship, three cruisers (not battle-cruisers), and six destroyers. The British losses, officially admitted and, with some exceptions, corresponding in the main with the German claims, consist of three battle-cruisers, three armored cruisers, and eight destroyers.

The actual course of the engagement and its main results appear tolerably clear. The scouts of the British cruiser squadron came into touch with the scouts of the German battle fleet. The cruiser squadron, under Admiral Beatty, hurried to engage the enemy and hold him in action until the British main battle fleet could come up. Admiral Beatty was supported presently by four fast Dreadnoughts of the Queen Elizabeth class, and together with these he pitted his cruiser squadron against the full strength of the German battle fleet. It was then that the three battle-cruisers were lost. With the arrival of the main British battle fleet towards evening, the enemy retired to his own ports pursued by the British. The victory is claimed by both sides. The result leaves the command of the seas in British hands, and the blockade of Germany unbroken.

Outweighing, we may be sure, in the public consciousness of Great Britain any loss of ships in the naval battle, was the news made public on Tuesday of the almost certain fate of Lord Kitchener. Admiral Jellicoe, in a dispatch published by the British Admiralty, reported that at 8 P. M. on Monday the cruiser Hampshire was torpedoed or struck a mine off the West Orkneys. Lord Kitchener and his staff were on board on their way to Russia. Although four boats got away, none have been reported, and it is feared, as we write, that owing to the heavy sea all on board perished.

To turn from the operations of mighty fleets to the daily routine of submarines is rather like mentioning Alexander the Coppersmith in the same breath with Alexander the Great. Merchant vessels reported torpedoed in the war zone since we wrote last week number ten: eight British, one Norwegian, and one Italian.

Dispatches from both Berlin and Washington express the opinion that one result of the battle in the North Sea will be to arrest German talk of peace. As a matter of fact, previous to the battle signs of reaction against the openness with which peace has recently been discussed in Germany were observable in the concluding period of the Reichstag's debate on the censorship, on May 30, when President Wilson as a possible mediator was bitterly assailed by a member of the National Liberal party. Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, in a recent interview, reiterated his statement that "the present war map must form the basis of peace," but Mr. Asquith, on May 31, replying to a question in the House of Commons regarding Germany's terms of peace, indicated that he attached no importance to the German Chancellor's recent utterances, and merely endorsed Sir Edward Grey's speech of the week previous on the subject.

There has been fighting of a violent character at Verdun, Ypres, and on the Italian front. At Verdun the familiar tale has been repeated of initial German successes checked and rolled back. At Ypres the Canadians have again withstood a violent onslaught. On the Italian front the Austrian offensive appears to have been checked. A Russian drive, started at the beginning of the week along the front from the Pripet marshes to the Rumanian frontier, resulted in considerable initial successes, including the capture of 13,000 Austrian prisoners and several guns.

The week has been one of feverish political activity in preparation for the Republican and Progressive Conventions, which opened yesterday. Early last week Colonel Roosevelt aroused enthusiasm in Kansas City, and in their own stronghold of St. Louis told German-Americans that the hyphen had no place in American citizenship. A certain number of German editors in America, whose action was promptly disavowed by other citizens of German origin, on May 30, in a midnight conference with Chairman Hilles, of the Republican National Committee, solemnly banned the Colonel by bell, book, and candle, and announced their allegiance to Justice Hughes. Justice Hughes has disavowed Mr. Hitchcock's activity at Chicago in pushing the movement to nominate him, and Mr. Hitchcock himself, in a statement published on Monday, disclaimed any authority to represent the Justice in a political way, and declared that he had come to Chicago "very reluctantly at the earnest solicitation of Hughes leaders in various parts of the country" to counteract certain reports which were designed to injure Justice Hughes. Meanwhile, the outstanding feature of the situation has been a steady drift towards Hughes during the days immediately preceding the Convention.

The nomination of Louis D. Brandeis to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States was confirmed by the Senate on June 1, by a vote of 47 to 22.

Carranza's long expected note, of many vicissitudes, was at last received in Washington on May 31. Stating that the actions of the United States have been in contradiction to its words and protestations, and that American troops are on Mexican soil in violation of that country's sovereignty and without the consent of the Mexican Government, the note requests the immediate withdrawal of those troops, and calls for an end of "this insupportable situation." As we write, the Administration has not yet replied to the note. There seems no reason to believe that any withdrawal of the troops is contemplated in the near future. General opinion is that the communication was intended for consumption in Mexico City at least as much as in Washington.

The naval budget was finally passed in the House on Friday of last week by a vote of 358 to 4. This result was, however, only accomplished after the Republicans, aided by a section of the Democratic party, had succeeded in adding considerably to the original estimates and had come within six votes of getting adopted the "big navy" programme of the Republican members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Preceding the final vote a motion to recommit the bill and include the Republican minority's building plan was only defeated by a vote of 189 to 183. Previously the advocates of a bigger building programme had been able to add thirty more submarines to the twenty first proposed and to increase the appropriation for aeronautics from $2,000,000 to $3,500,000.

News came on June 1 of the safe arrival at Port Stanley, Falkland Islands, of Sir Ernest Shackleton. His ship, the Endurance, was crushed in the ice floes in the Weddell Sea last October, and the explorer reached civilization with five companions in a small boat to summon help for twenty-two of his company who were left on Elephant Island. A relief expedition will be organized by the British Government.

No definite news has come to hand up to the time of writing concerning the progress of Mr. Lloyd George's effort to arrange the Irish question. Unofficial reports are, however, to the effect that an agreement is in sight on the basis of a limited application of the Home Rule bill, with Ulster, in whole or in part, excluded from its operation.

The death of Yuan Shi-Kai, President, Emperor, and again President of China, was announced in dispatches from Shanghai on Tuesday.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

Against Berlin's specific statement of Sunday that the German losses off Jutland were no larger than those mentioned in the official communiqué of last Friday, we have London's statement that the falsity of Berlin's claims is "certain." But until London's counter-claims are based on something more concrete than "the strongest reasons for supposing," we must refrain from changing a German success into a British victory. The elements entering into the problem are many. Even in the matter of tonnage, there may be losses incurred without the actual sinking of a ship. It may be, for instance, that the British claims of four German first-line ships sunk are based on these ships being badly hit, with the assumption that they would be lost; just as the Germans assumed that the Warspite was lost when she was damaged. The Germans had a much shorter distance to tow their disabled ships than the British had. If the Warspite got into port, it may be that severely wounded German battleships got into port. While not counting as losses, such ships take months in the repairing and represent a weakening of the fleet, and so enter into the total results of the battle.

But, whatever the actual loss or damage on both sides may prove to have been, the oustanding fact is that the control of the seas is as securely British to-day as it has been since the beginning of the war. The real question is whether British transports are less safe than they were on May 30, whether the flood of supplies and food into Great Britain and of men and munitions out of Great Britain is in any way hampered, whether the seas are any more open to German commerce, whether the blockade against Germany has weakened. The answer to this question is obvious. But a second question must also be answered. Admitting that the German fleet is still confessedly inferior to a full trial of strength for the mastery of the seas, how many such exploits as that of May 31 would be necessary before the British fleet had been reduced to a point where the Germans might be in a position to try out full conclusions? If British naval skill was outmatched once, it might happen again and again. But the evidence now is that the British were at all events not so badly outwitted as appeared from the first reports. Admiral Beatty's battle cruisers were not caught in a trap. Rather he chose to take a great risk for the sake of winning a great victory. He did not win it; but he did not stumble into defeat.

When Winston Churchill declared in the House of Commons that a study of British recruiting figures leaves the enormous number of one and three-quarter millions of men unaccounted for, he touched upon a point that has long puzzled the outside observer. More than five million men have been enlisted. The British casualties are probably about 800,000 by this time, and the number of recoveries from wounds is so large that the number of permanently incapacitated cannot be more than half a million. This leaves four and a half million men who ought to be at the front or in training, whereas it would appear that less than a million men are actually holding the British lines on all fronts. The statements by Mr. Tennant, Mr. McKenna, and Premier Asquith do not contradict Churchill's assertion that a disproportionately large number of men are being held at home. Mr. Tennant speaks of the imminent dispatch of large reinforcements and the Premier emphasizes the need of guarding against invasion. This last acknowledgment will create a much more unfavorable impression on the Continent than if the confession were bluntly made that millions of men must still complete their training or must wait for equipment and munitions. If in addition to the British fleet, enormous numbers of men must be kept at home to safeguard the islands against a contingency which Mr. Asquith regards as impossible, there will be some basis for the feeling among the French and Russians that Great Britain gives more thought to the timid British householder than to the pressing needs of the Allies on the fighting line.

The success with which Federal justice has run down and punished violators of our neutrality laws is no reason for doubting the need for the eighteen amendments proposed by Attorney-General Gregory. In some cases the new acts will operate chiefly as deterrents. In others they will expedite justice by substituting a direct for an indirect method of punishing offences against neutrality; and in a few, they will specifically cover crimes hitherto of a border-line character, in which it has been difficult to prosecute. It must be remembered that most of the Teutonic agents indicted have transgressed our laws on more than one count, and the Government has been able to choose as ground for prosecution the particular misconduct that offered the clearest case. The Attorney-General explains that the threatening of exporters has hitherto been an act not easily dealt with; that the provisions of the radio law are too restricted; that the inspection of cargoes of suspected vessels has been difficult; that even the law against setting fires or placing bombs on ships has contained "many difficulties of enforcement." Three important provisions are directed against the assisting of revolutionists abroad. So much is to be done to guarantee the continued fulfilment of Washington's prediction 120 years ago that "if we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we . . . may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected."

Carranza stresses a debating point when he cites the authority of our own officers to show that Villa's bands have been dispersed, and therefore argues that our mission in Mexico is ended. He chooses to overlook the very important consideration of what would happen if Villa should emerge from hiding and enter upon a new career of mischief. There need not be any more raids over the border. Any demonstration of consequence by Villa, if directed against the de-facto Government, would create a state of feeling in this country that might work infinite harm to Carranza. Villa must be held fast to his hiding place, and the Villistas must remain dispersed. This may be attained by the concentration of enough Mexican forces in the north. Carranza has such forces at his disposal. He faces no serious opposition elsewhere in Mexico. He faces no military problem in the north, but only a police problem. When he has given complete assurances of his ability to deal with that task, it will be time to speak of a retirement of the American troops. That problem is now being discussed between Gen. Pershing and Gen. Gavira, and through such discussions lies the way to a solution.

A Presidential candidate who refuses to talk, or to announce his plans, is exposed to all kinds of foolish stories. Some of them, however, are so inherently incredible that they require no denial on personal authority. Of such a nature is the yarn from Chicago that Mr. Hughes, if nominated, will not resign from the Supreme Court, but will stick closely to his judicial duties up to the very eve of being inaugurated President, if he is elected. But it requires no one in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confidence of Judge Hughes to brand this report as absurd. Ordinary sense has all along pointed to the necessity of Hughes leaving the bench if he is nominated for the Presidency. It is not only a question of judicial propriety; it is a question of human limits and the exigencies of a Presidential campaign. The latter will demand all the time and energy of the Republican nominee. He will have an enormous amount of work to do which he can neither neglect nor delegate. He will have to give his party an active leadership. That he could do all this while still wreaking himself upon his judicial labors is so obviously impossible that nobody but a newspaper romancer, hard up for matters to write about, could have invented this story of Hughes's purpose not to resign from the Supreme Court.

The confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Brandeis by the Senate has brought to a close a contest which possessed extraordinary interest and which was pressed by both sides with unusual vigor. Upon its merits we have sufficiently expressed our opinion. While not reciting once more the objections which in our judgment attached to the selection, we are glad to repeat that, so far as high civic purpose is concerned, Mr. Brandeis deserves the praise that has been bestowed upon him by the President and others. Of the story of the contest there is one aspect upon which everybody should be able to reflect with pleasure. The question of religious or racial prejudice, which came up somewhat prominently immediately after the nomination was made, soon dropped out of sight. It was plain that Mr. Brandeis would not be hurt by it, but rather helped; for while probably no Senator was going to vote against him because he was a Jew, it seemed likely that some who objected to him upon other grounds might be deterred from opposition for fear that their action would be ascribed to religious discrimination. But the actual course of the affair has been far better than this; evidently the issue of religion or race has played but a small part in it. There is occasion for no little satisfaction in the thought that the country is so firmly anchored in the principles of religious equality, and of the separation of Church and state, that neither the nomination of a Jew to a Justiceship of the Supreme Court, nor the fact that it is presided over by a Catholic, gives rise to the slightest disturbance of mind among any but an insignificant minority of American citizens.

The small majority, 35 to 32, by which the Senate passed the Rivers and Harbors bill arouses the hope that the $44,000,000 it carries will be substantially reduced in conference. The House cannot see with indifference the addition by eleven Senators of items of local interest. Either a larger total, so as to accommodate a few more Representatives, or a deep cut, would seem inevitable. But a larger total is hardly conceivable under present circumstances. People will be inclined to credit Senator Kenyon's assertion that half of the appropriation "is absolutely unjustifiable." The disappointment over the bill is the greater in that a start had apparently been made towards a more scientific arrangement for these expenditures. But the resolution to leave the distribution of the appropriation once more to the army engineers and the Secretary of War was defeated, while amendments to create a River and Harbor Commission went out on points of order. The final vote leaves the Republicans unable to stigmatize the measure as a sample of Democratic extravagance and inconsistency. If two of the seven Republicans voting for it had voted against it, its fate would have been sealed. If, however, it reaches the President in anything like its present shape, nothing but his veto can save his party from bearing the odium of it.

The failure of the attack upon the Rivers and Harbors bill has apparently helped the House Committee on Public Buildings to screw its courage up to the presentation of a measure carrying $20,000,000. The President is known to be opposed to new projects; and some of the more responsible men in Congress would like to see provision made for a better oversight of expenditures before further appropriations. No one can glance at the list of bills for the erection of public buildings in little towns all over the country, from San Mateo, Cal., to Louisa, Va., without realizing that half of them stand for some Representative's hope of strengthening his fences for reëlection. Any fight against the bill ought to mean support for the pending measure requiring all proposals for public buildings to be submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for investigation, and a report upon the need for the buildings, the expenditure which is justified, and the lowest cost at which they can be erected.

Interpretations of the Workmen's Compensation laws in various States show how impossible it is to create a perfect body of social legislation at a stroke. A start must be made and experience must then come in to shape the original statute into conformity with the facts of life. In New Jersey the higher courts have had to rule in the case of the driver of a brewery wagon who was shot by an unknown hand while making deliveries in a section of Atlantic City given up to the criminal and disorderly classes. The courts decided that, in the absence of proof that the employers were cognizant of the character of the neighborhood, they were not liable to compensation. In New York State it was ruled some time ago that a subway workman who lost his life in going to the aid of a fellow-worker came within the provisions of the compensation law. The necessary lessons of experience are well to keep in mind when people speak hastily of the "results" of this or that important piece of social or political legislation. The enactment of the law is only the beginning. Patient testing and improvement are required to bring the underlying idea to thorough realization.

The theory that the recall is a sort of handy "gun behind the door" is not borne out by conditions in Oregon. A number of recall elections were held at the same time as the recent primaries. All of them were caused by the tremendous issue of what roads should be benefited by the money that the county concerned was going to spend upon its highways. People in every section insisted that the money should be spent upon their road or roads, and the county commissioners, having to leave out somebody, inevitably became the object of recall petitions. One county had the piquant experience of recalling one set of commissioners, only to find that the new set was not able to please everybody any more satisfactorily than the board it had succeeded in ousting. With impartial justice, the recallers were promptly placed upon a ballot to recall them. In consequence of this uncertainty, in which the only certainty is that of making enemies, "many worthy citizens," according to the *Oregon Voter*, are refusing to be candidates for these offices. But if a man may not decline to run for President in Oregon, surely he should not be permitted exemption from a county commissionership.

President Wilson's words to the graduating class of the Naval Academy were at once a challenge to the highest in them and a rebuke to their over-zealous friends. Appealed to to excuse a midshipman from the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penalty incurred by some infraction of discipline, it was his practice, he said, to reply: "Yes, I know college boys, but while these youngsters are college boys, they are something more. They are officers of the United States. Any dereliction of duty on the part of a naval officer of the United States may involve the fortunes of a nation and cannot be overlooked." It is a pity that these words could not be heard by all the Congressmen and officials in the various departments at Washington. If a midshipman cannot be relieved of just punishment because of his position as an officer of the Government, what is to be said of the action of the member of Congress who uses his position as an officer of the Government to have him "let off"? It is none too easy at best to keep an aristocratic air out of our military and naval establishment. Favoritism in any form, and especially a favoritism made possible by political influence, is incapable of defence.

It was probably fortunate that Sir Ernest Shackleton's expedition for the crossing of the Antarctic Continent from the South American side broke down at the same time as did the expedition from Australia which was to meet him on his emergence. Without fresh supplies and other assistance after his 400-mile journey across a totally unknown plateau, he might easily have perished. The whole affair is a warning of the risks faced by any attempt at exploration which depends upon a nice coördination of effort between two bodies setting out at points widely distant, with no means for communication. Yet a quick journey across the whole of the south polar regions could be accomplished in no other way, and it would have eclipsed in some ways any feat yet achieved in either the Arctic or Antarctic. The most picturesque aspect of the attempt will remain Shackleton's journey back from the South Shetland Islands to the Falkland Islands in a 22-foot boat—a journey probably covering 1,000 miles and lasting six weeks. To match it we should have to go back to the De Long expedition of the early eighties, when of three small boats setting out on a similar trip but one came safely in.

A bequest of $160,000 to an American university is not, in itself, in these days when millions have become common, calculated to attract general notice. But it is rarely that such a bequest comes from so interesting a source as it does in the case of the late Dr. J. W. White, professor emeritus in the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. White's eminence as a surgeon was matched not only by his zeal and loyalty as an alumnus and trustee of his University, but also by his ardent interest in the affairs of the world, especially at this time of unparalleled trial. Of the sum bequeathed, $150,000 is to form an endowment for a professorship of surgical research, and the remaining $10,000 goes to the hospital of the University, to provide prizes for nurses and doctors and Christmas presents for children. A peculiarly interesting feature of Dr. White's will is that which relates to the posthumous publication of some of his writings, including a certain diary as well as "various contributions to general and medical literature, and other documents" concerning the selection of which he has left a memorandum of instructions. His object in this is indicated as follows:

> I desire the publication to be made on such terms and in such manner as shall constitute it a memorial which may be of interest as preserving a record of certain manners, customs, and peculiarities of this period, of incidents in the life of an ordinary citizen of Philadelphia, and of a teacher and practitioner of surgery in the last half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.

Surely a valuable by-product of a distinguished professional career, and one that future generations will prize.

For the next five years at least, Philadelphia will stand beside Boston, New York, Chicago, and Cincinnati in having an orchestra whose expenses are guaranteed. This is made possible by the action of a person who prefers to be known simply as "the donor." The gift is welcomed, less as relieving the present contributors to the guarantee fund of their annual burden than as imparting impetus to the movement for an endowment of the orchestra. So long as efforts had to be made to meet the yearly deficit, the larger task could not be undertaken, or was not undertaken, with much hope of early success. Those interested will now be spurred to do all they can to raise the endowment during the five years in which they are free of the old demand. What Chicago did in this respect, Philadelphia ought to be able to do. People do not always understand, or remember, that even if every seat were sold for every performance of a first-class orchestra at the highest price that could be got for it, there would still be a margin between receipts and expenses. That we should have a dozen endowed orchestras ought to be as much a matter of course as our possession of endowed libraries and universities by the hundred.

"When 3,500 women ticket sellers for the Allied Bazaar completed their day's canvass of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx late last evening the official count of the sale at the ticket headquarters, 120 Broadway, was 565,401." This is one of the most inspiriting items of news we have come across in a long time. It means on its face $140,000 which will go to the relief of human suffering, and it means more than that. It shows how much can be done by concerted effort even through the collection of small sums—how great is the number of persons who are willing to give if they but realize that many are giving and that there is therefore a prospect of large results. We have as yet scarcely tapped the resources of this nation in generosity, in willingness to help when the world is in such dire need of help. Our own country is favored with such abundance that it can help on a grand scale without a particle of hardship to anybody. If $140,000 can be raised in a day by the sale of 25-cent tickets, how many millions ought we not to be able to obtain by an organized effort directed with similar earnestness and enthusiasm to the getting of large sums from those able to give them.

An uprising by the Greek people against their King under the leadership of Venizelos does not lie in the lap of the immediate future. The reckoning will probably come, but after the war. From no people in Europe, or for that matter in the civilized world, is it hidden what war means today, and Greece has been a very close spectator. All the more must the people hesitate before the prospect of adding the miseries of civil conflict to foreign strife. A revolt against King Constantine because of the seizure of Greek forts by the Bulgars would mean, of course, war against the latter, and at best it would not mean a very efficient campaign that a distracted country could wage against an enemy standing in arms. Whereas the recent Bulgar advance is, in all probability, a precautionary movement against the Allies, and does not necessarily mean fighting on Greek soil; whereas the plans of the Allies at Salonica may also be precautionary to the very end of the war, a revolution in Athens would naturally set the armies in motion on all sides, and the country would be transformed into one great battlefield.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPUBLICANS AND THE SENATE.

"With Roosevelt running on a third ticket, Congress would also be lost; but Wilson might be chosen over Hughes, and yet the House be Republican; which is worth striving for." This observation, made in the Springfield *Republican* recently, was quoted with approval by the *Ohio State Journal*, which proceeded to pronounce, on its own account: "But whether he [Wilson] or a Republican is chosen, we are quite certain to have a Republican Congress." This assurance is interesting as showing what a cheerful frame of mind a member of the party that is "out" can work himself into when he tries. One of the few certainties in an unusually mixed political situation is that the party that elects the President in November will also elect the House of Representatives. It may lose the House two years later, but it is sure to start with it. The ticklish point is the control of the Senate. Here the question that presses for an answer is not, Can anything keep a victorious Republican party from making a clean sweep of the Capitol? but Will even a victory in the electoral college enable the Republicans to gain a plurality in the Senate?

At present, the Democrats are intrenched there with a majority of sixteen. However small this may look to Republican eyes, it has seemed large enough to cool-headed Progressives to serve as basis for the suggestion that if their old-time comrades really wish to "come back" in full power, it behooves them to close up the ranks completely. What will it profit the Republicans to elect a President who would be faced by a hostile Senate? Yet how can they hope to turn an adverse majority of sixteen into a favorable majority, no matter how narrow, unless they have the hearty support of the Progressives? Only a remnant of the new party voted for Progressive candidates for Representatives in 1914, yet the vote it cast was sufficient to keep several aspiring Republicans at home, and the Democrats retained their hold in the House, although by a greatly reduced majority. It will not be enough for the Republican and the Progressive Conventions to nominate the same man for President. Not only must there be no third candidate, but the one named must be strong enough to draw the Progressives to the polls. A few hundred sulking stay-at-homes here and there, and the Republicans may succeed in capturing the White House only to find themselves forced to make terms with the enemy at the Senate end of the Capitol.

The Republicans must hold their present Senators and get eight more. This would merely tie the vote, but the Vice-President could be counted upon to turn the scale. Where are the eight to come from? The terms of thirty-three Senators expire on the fourth of next March. Of these, 18 are Democrats and 15 are Republicans. The Republicans represent California, Connecticut, Delaware, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming—every one of them safely Republican States if any are so. Of the 18 Democrats whose terms expire next March, only 5 are from the Solid South—Bryan of Florida, Williams of Mississippi, Lea of Tennessee, Culberson of Texas, and Swanson of Virginia. Missouri has a Senator among the 18, and would once have been ranked with the five States just named, but in 1904 and 1908 it cast its electoral vote for a Republican. Still, the sober-minded member of that party will not look with much expectancy to that State this year, with a favorite son ensconced in the Speaker's chair. Nor will he count upon Arizona, which might as well be in the Solid South, or Maryland. This leaves only 11 seats in doubt.

These eleven come from ten States, Indiana having both her Senators to elect, on account of the death of Senator Shively. And it is to Indiana that the Republicans will look for two of their required eight. They can hardly figure out a victory for their Presidential nominee without Indiana, and so fate must be conceded to have done its best for them in creating the additional vacancy there just when it did. They will surely look to New York for another Senator. Republican victory without this State is not dreamed of. That makes three. Ordinarily, New Jersey would be listed with New York, but the President's own State will not be counted by the unexcited Republican. This leaves Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, and West Virginia—all safely Republican when Bryan and free silver do not detach some of them. Add them, and we have one more than the necessary eight. But this is counting every possibility. It is assuming a party united, not merely in form, but in reality. It is assuming an old-time Republican victory of happy pre-Progressive days. Let the election be close, and the Senate will remain out of Republican reach.

CAN THE ARMY BE RECRUITED?

Whether the new army can or cannot be recruited is a pressing question, now that the President has signed the bill. The Adjutant-General has said that 140,000 is the largest number he could successfully undertake to recruit; 175,000 some officers believe possible, in view of all the talk of war. Some observers believe that Senator Chamberlain and others who clamored for an army of 250,000, and also favor universal service, purposely aimed at a higher figure than it was possible to obtain in order to say a year hence that the failure to recruit the necessary men left no other alternative than to Prussianize America by compulsory service. We know that the attempt to recruit 20,000 men in haste to reinforce Funston and Pershing has resulted in a total enlistment of only 8,141 in seventy-two days after the passage of the law. As the wastage from deaths, desertion, and discharges is fully 2,000 a month, the net gain is therefore only 4,000, and this despite every exertion and the possibility of trouble in Mexico. As a matter of fact, the showing is probably worse, since in the fiscal year 1914-15 there were 48,893 reënlistments, with the total strength less than 105,000. Out of every two soldiers, one had to be enlisted or reenlisted, and it took no less than 129 officers and 831 enlisted men away from their regiments (except 37 retired officers) to accomplish this. How many regiments of recruiters will 200,000 call for?

But it must be remembered that never in our history was a recruiting campaign undertaken under less favorable economic conditions. Barring the outcry for preparedness and the Mexican situation, the recruiting officers have had no appeal to make, and the preparedness parades only seem to indicate that the paraders wish some one else to do the preparing. We have not heard of many enlisting. The week following the preparedness parade of 125,000 men and women saw only sixty-four enlistments for the regulars in New York city. Even the local National Guard, after marching detachments through the streets, doing unlimited advertising in the press, by banners, signs, etc., failed to obtain by at least 700 the 3,000 men it needed by May 31. So far as the regulars are concerned, they are facing an unprecedented situation of labor. When the Butte miners are striking for $24 a week; when ordinary manual labor is striking hereabouts for $2.50 a day; when the zinc companies in New Jersey are paying $4 a day,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the recruiting sergeant's offer of $15 *a month* for ordinary private soldiers and $19 for first-grade privates, and up to $75 a month for non-commissioned officers, is hardly alluring. Never in recent times has there been such a scarcity of labor, particularly of farm labor, as to-day; so that if there should be an exodus of our foreign-born citizens to Europe after the war to take the places of the victims of the war, and but little immigration, we may look for a serious shortage, constant strikes, and rapidly rising compensation. The army always does best in times of depression.

Even of late years, however, the army has not been drawing a uniformly valuable set of men. An officer who has recently been stationed at Fort Leavenworth, where he has been observing the disciplinary battalion there—a step forward in penal reform in the army, taken with a view of saving to the service offenders guilty of minor crimes or strictly military offences—tells us that there is little prospect of redeeming many of these prisoners. This is because so many of them are of inferior mental quality; some are insubordinate, though of sound physique. A part of the difficulty the army has is owing to unsatisfactory work in selection by recruiting officers and surgeons. The cost of recruiting and delivering the recruit to the regiments or depots is extravagantly high—like almost everything else in the army. It is said to be $70 a man. And this despite the lure of oversea service, in Panama, Hawaii, the Philippines, etc., and the fact that the $15 a month is pure spending money, since the soldier receives board and lodging and so liberal an allowance for clothes that a careful man may save a good deal during his enlistment. So that the $15 wage is the equivalent of much more than in civil life—but the difference is that in the army a man's time is not his own. The American laborer loves to roam. Hitherto, he has despised the soldier who lets himself be bossed by men who give themselves the airs of a higher caste.

The army, as it is organized to-day, may truthfully be described, not as a purely military affair, but one run chiefly for the officers and their families. There is little, if any, of the *camaraderie* between officers and men that is to be found in the French army, without impairment of discipline. The line between the American soldier and his officer is hard and fast, according to Anglo-Saxon precedent. When it comes to punishments the soldier is far more severely handled by courts-martial than are officers. Thus, the colonel of the Third Infantry was court-martialled last winter for chaining to a post for hours a private who had struck him. The private was sentenced to five years at hard labor; the colonel, who also violated the regulations, was acquitted, but reprimanded by the reviewing authority. So long as our army posts are run with greater thought for the creature comforts of the commissioned circle than for purely military affairs, as at West Point, where there are hundreds of special-service soldiers to care for horses, equipment, artillery, etc., there will not be much attraction to the colors. The new seven-year enlistment period is also likely to prove a stumbling-block which will not be offset by the fact that the Army bill provides that hereafter army posts shall be schools for the training of men for trades or civilian occupations during the present long hours of idleness which makes the soldiers restless and discontented. Finally, Congress and the Administration have deliberately turned their backs on our best soldier-material—the negroes—the one group eager to enlist by reason of their restricted economic opportunities. Our preparedness is to be white preparedness. "Negroes not admitted" is the sign which one finds everywhere.

THE MINIMUM WAGE FOR WOMEN.

The article by Professor Taussig on "Minimum Wages for Women," in the current number of the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, would deserve special attention as being one of the very few discussions of the subject in its broadest aspects thus far published by any leading American economist, even if its inherent merit were far less than it is. That merit is, in our judgment, all the greater because of the almost absolute limitation of the discussion to one form, and that the simplest, of the minimum-wage proposal. Not only is the subject of the minimum wage for men excluded altogether, but, except in some closing remarks, Professor Taussig does not consider such adjustment of the minimum as can be made by special boards with discretionary powers a minimum which would vary for the various grades of labor, but solely the proposal of "a single minimum, designed to be effective for the lowest-paid grade of women's labor only," and fixed by legislative enactment.

It is this proposal that has chiefly attracted public attention in the United States; and it is an understanding of its essential bearings that Professor Taussig's paper is designed to promote. As he says, there has been a great deal of collection and summarizing of the facts about women's pay, but very little competent consideration either of the real economic meaning of those facts or of the probable working, in the long run, of the proposed attempt to alter them. And certain of the broadest facts are often lost sight of. Among these, some of the most important are that "of all the women employed, at least half are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five"; that in the lowest-paid group the proportion of the young is very much greater than this; and that of this group of girl-workers 80 per cent. live at home and contribute "the larger part of their earnings to the home treasury."

No part of the subject is more acutely discussed by Professor Taussig than this last. No statement has been more prominently put forward than that a girl living at home, and receiving less than the amount which investigation declares to be requisite for the maintenance of a woman living independently, is necessarily a "parasite," the deficit being supplied by other members of her family. But the assertion will not bear examination. One of the tests which Professor Taussig applies to it is particularly striking:

> Suppose that into the budget of a family whose head earns $12 or $15 a week a girl brings an additional $6. In a working-class family the difference between $12 and $18 a week is great; it is the difference between having hardly any margin at all and something like ease. It means that the family is well above the poverty line. Is the girl who brings in $6 a parasite? Is she a drag or a prop? Or suppose that the young woman who has been bringing home $6 a week drops from the family—dies or marries. The specific expenses entailed by her presence cease; her specific contribution to the family income also ceases. Is the family better off, or worse? Neither parent would hesitate for a moment in answering that the family had lost, not gained. Can it be maintained that the young woman is a parasite?

As for the working women who do not form part of a family group, Professor Taussig, while pointing out that "their wages appear to be usually above the lowest rates and above the average," recognizes that their lot is hard, and that among them "there must be no small number of individuals whose case is pitiable." Nothing can be plainer than the earnestness of his desire that their condition may be improved. But the question has to be squarely met whether the prescription of the minimum wage would be effective in bettering the lot of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these individuals. Their pay is small under the unregulated operation of competition because the number of those who offer the kind of labor they furnish is large relatively to the demand for that kind of labor. If a higher rate of pay were prescribed by law, this would tend both to diminish the demand for that labor and to increase the supply of it. Many girls and women who are not drawn from the home to the factory or the department store, many who are not drawn from the country to the city, by the prospect of $6 a week would be so drawn by the attraction of a guaranteed minimum of $8. Naturally, with the larger supply there would go a selection of the more efficient; and the less efficient would be thrown out of work altogether.

That this last would not necessarily be an unmixed evil, that its effect might be counterbalanced by proper measures, is not denied by Professor Taussig; but he points out the great difficulties of the problem which it presents. And whatever may be the just conclusion after all these things are taken into account, to omit them is to deal in a haphazard and short-sighted way with a question of great difficulty as well as gravity. This is admitted by some—though by very few—of those who urge the minimum wage; Professor Seager, for example, one of its ablest and most earnest advocates, clearly recognizes that, in order that it may accomplish the good intended by it without causing the correlative hardship above indicated, extensive measures of care for the welfare and the economic development of the less efficient would have to be instituted.

In summing up, Professor Taussig says, first, that "the immense majority of women who work in factories and like employments do not need as a minimum" the sum most frequently contemplated, $8 a week; and secondly, that to require the payment of this minimum "would not bring about the employment of all at any such rate" and would result in "a failure to attain the desired end." Nevertheless, he does not recommend a policy of *laissez-faire* in the matter. Wages boards may do much to regulate, standardize, and protect the wages of women, and to effect what is feasible in the raising of them. They would enforce no simple or rigid standard. They "would have to proceed by rule of thumb." This is not so attractive as the sweeping away of all difficulties by a single stroke; but it has the great merit of not injecting into a highly complex situation an element of profound disturbance, of which the evil effect may outweigh the good immediately compassed or intended.

MOSBY, THE GUERRILLA.

The most picturesque of the few remaining notables of the Civil War was John S. Mosby, who died last week in Washington, thus surviving by half a century the period of his numerous hairbreadth escapes. Reported dead as often as the German Crown Prince in the present war, he was as bitterly hated in the North as any Prussian in Belgium. Indeed, when one recalls the fury which his successful raiding aroused in the North, and notes no mention of it in the accounts of his career now appearing, there is reason to hope that the antagonisms engendered by the struggle abroad may also fade away within the lifetime of living men. Mosby himself never surrendered, fleeing the country in fear of the hatreds he had aroused, until amnesty was declared.

He was not in any sense a great cavalry commander, like J. E. B. Stuart, or Nathan Forrest, or Morgan. His command was small, usually not over one hundred men, and its name, "Mosby's Partisan Rangers," clearly enough indicated its irregular character. Its purpose was frankly to annoy the enemy incessantly by sudden dashes upon his pickets. Sometimes, as when he rode into the Federal lines with but twenty-nine men and captured a Federal general in bed, his actions caused infinite chagrin to the Federals. Whole brigades were frequently set upon his track; lines of communication were necessarily strengthened, thus weakening the combatant forces, and still he was on one occasion able to ride completely round McClellan's army. Thus the indirect results of his activities were far beyond the actual military successes achieved; he was a gad-fly forever upon the Federal flanks, which no retaliatory lunge was able to destroy. Then as a source of news to the Confederate chieftains he was unsurpassed. As he himself once described his activities:

> As a line is only as strong as its weakest point it was necessary for the enemy to be as strong as I was at every point to resist my attacks. . . . To destroy supply trains, to break up the means of conveying intelligence, thus isolating an army from its bases, as well as the different corps from each other, to confuse their plans by capturing dispatches, are the objects of partisan war. It is just as legitimate to fight an enemy in the rear as in front. The only difference is in the danger.

Of danger, Mosby certainly had his fill—enough to make him content to live so peaceful and quiet a life, barring a political campaign or two on behalf of his old enemy, Grant, from whom he was happy to accept an office in 1878—despite Grant's frequent denunciation of him in war-time—that many people were doubtless surprised to know that Col. Mosby still survived. He himself was aroused only when criticisms of the legitimacy of his warfare appeared; then the war-horse was himself again. But he will remain for all time one of the shining examples of the prompt and skilful use of cavalry by the Confederates. Not he nor Morgan nor Forrest had any previous military experience. But their natural talents were speedily made use of by the Confederate authorities, with the result that to their efforts and those of other cavalrymen were due in considerable measure the early Confederate successes. The Federals, on the other hand, utterly refused to see the possibilities of cavalry until Stuart, Forrest, and Mosby had repeatedly ridden round the Union armies. The old Federal saying of the first two years of the war, that "nobody ever saw a dead cavalryman," was chiefly owing to the fact that the Northern cavalry rarely received a chance, besides being badly armed and equipped.

Not until Grierson and Stoneman came to the front by their raids were leaves taken out of the books of their adversaries—with what profit the extraordinary campaign of Gen. James H. Wilson's independent cavalry force in 1865 testifies, for it thought nothing of whipping Forrest himself and of capturing forts by cavalry charges. It was in the spring of 1863 that the awakening came in the North. The New York *Evening Post* of May 4, 1863, thus heralded the change in policy:

> The rebels much earlier than we discovered that cavalry was useful even in the thickly wooded and thinly settled Southern districts. Morgan, Stuart, and other rebel rough riders showed that with spirit and energy cavalry can work almost anywhere. The enemy maintained, from an early day in the war, a large regular mounted force and numerous irregular troops; and everybody knows how our operations, East and West, were disturbed and made difficult; how the rebels were encouraged and the loyal cast down by those bold and stirring movements of Stuart in the East and Morgan in the West, which came to be popularly known as "raids." Appearances indicate that we are at last about to make use of this arm as has not been done before.

It is easy to speculate what might have happened had the North been awake to the use of cavalry. But the South had drawn more than its share of talented officers, and fewer bureaucrats of the conventional regu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lar-army type—which is a fact overlooked by those glib advocates of preparedness, who say that if we had had a large regular army in 1861 the North would have marched direct to Richmond. The flower of the regulars would have gone South in the same proportion, and the Forrests and Mosbys would still have dropped their law books and ploughs to reveal the amazing military skill and daring that lay dormant within them.

THE MAN WHO PURIFIED SHAKESPEARE.

This was Thomas Bowdler, physician, traveller, philanthropist, and man of letters, who in the year 1818 published "The Family Shakespeare," and within a short time had given a new word to the language. As public taste moved on towards broader standards of literary propriety, the verb "to bowdlerize" suffered corresponding degradation. Bowdlerism was at first officious meddling with a text, then it was exaggerated squeamishness, then it became a sign of actual pruriency in the mind of the editor. Needless to say, our own liberal age has little mercy for what it might call the fine flower of Mid-Victorianism were it not that Bowdler's work was done twenty years before Victoria came to the throne. Present-day opinion is probably well represented by Richard Whiteing, who speaks of him in the *Manchester Guardian* as one endowed with "a sense of smell for impropriety never perhaps equalled in the domain of letters." This is flagrant exaggeration even as an estimate of Bowdler's actual treatment of Shakespeare's text, not to speak of the specific purpose which the editor had in mind. It is not likely that very many of those who take it for granted that Bowdler was a man with an unhealthy imagination who played havoc with Shakespeare's text have ever looked to see just how bad his changes were. More than that, the impression is possibly widespread that Bowdler rewrote Shakespeare. Mr. Whiteing speaks of the narrow escape we have had from "the fatuous attempt to rewrite every masterpiece of literature." And yet he quotes from Bowdler's title-page: "The Family Shakespeare: in which nothing is added to the original text, but those words and expressions are omitted which cannot with propriety be read in a family."

"The Family Shakespeare" was an edition for the use of conscientious parents. "I can hardly imagine a more pleasing occupation for a winter's evening in the country," writes the editor, "than for a father to read one of Shakespeare's plays to his family circle. My object is to enable him to do so without incurring the danger of falling unawares among words and expressions which are of such a nature as to raise a blush on the cheeks of modesty or render it necessary for the reader to pause and examine the sequel before he proceeds further in the entertainment of the evening." If to-day we feel no need of such safeguards for the blushing cheek of youth, the principal reason is probably that the habit of reading in the family circle is a dead institution, certainly the habit of reading Shakespeare aloud. That Bowdler knew something of psychology is indicated in the distinction he draws in his preface to "Othello" between this very act of reading in company and reading to one's self. "Othello" perplexed him greatly. He could remove "the multitude of indecent expressions which abound in the speeches of the inferior characters," but he could not edit the Moor himself without "altering his character" and "destroying the Tragedy." He therefore chose to deviate from his original principle rather than "materially injure a most invaluable exertion of the genius of Shakespeare." But if there should be parents who found the play not sufficiently correct for family reading, "I would advise the transferring of it from the parlour to the cabinet." It is hardly just to heap unqualified obloquy upon an editor who was addressing himself *virginibus puerisque.*

The popularity of "The Family Shakespeare" was immediate and sustained. There were four editions between 1818 and 1824, and at least five other editions in the next fifty years. Apparently, a balance ought to be struck between the good Bowdler may have done Shakespeare in winning him an audience and the harm he may have done in weakening Shakespeare. On this point, as we have intimated, posterity has assumed that Bowdler did his worst, without going to the trouble of looking into his text. Such an examination would show, on the one hand, "Hamlet" deprived perhaps of two dozen lines, and "Measure for Measure" liberally pruned of its extraneous and stupid indecency, without apparent harm in the second play to the powerful scenes between Isabella and Angelo or Isabella and her brother, which alone have meaning to a modern reader. At any rate, it would be shown that Bowdler's hand fell lightest on those plays which are most widely read; and perhaps the abused editor would be found justified by that very test of survival.

Naturally, if one wants to get at the mind of Shakespeare—and it is very much the fashion to be getting at the mind of an author—not a word of his text can be spared. It is on record that there are readers whose anxiety to get at the mind of George Moore made it impossible for them to read anything but the unexpurgated edition of the "Memoirs of My Dead Life," suppressed in this country with a loss to the interests of literature which we will not stop to appraise. Yet Bowdler has had his apologists. One of them wrote:

> More nauseous and more foolish cant was never chattered than that which would deride the memory or depreciate the merits of Bowdler. No man ever did better service to Shakespeare than the man who made it possible to put him into the hands of intelligent and imaginative children. It may well be, if we consider how dearly the creator of Mamillius [in "The Winter's Tale"] must have loved them, that no man has ever done him such good service.

This was not written in 1825 by Macaulay, but in the year 1894 by Agernon Charles Swinburne. If the author of "Laus Veneris" could put up with Shakespeare bowdlerized, there may be something to be said for the much-abused purifier.

Foreign Correspondence

A RESUSCITATED MINISTRY.

By SIR HENRY LUCY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, May 13.

Mr. Gladstone used to tell with keen amusement, that belied superficial judgment denying him sense of humor, a story of what a Tory dame of high degree said to him on the eve of the general election of 1880, made memorable by the Midlothian campaign and the swamping of Disraeli's Government. "I see," she said in acrid tone, "you are popping up again." Mr. Asquith is popping up again. Indeed, the evolution is, at least for the moment, accomplished. As from time to time happened to Turkey, that Sick Man his Majesty's Government has, by an unexpected turn of events, suddenly become convalescent, with fair promise of prolonged life. Ten days ago it was apparently *in extremis.* In quick succession followed the surrender of a British army in Mesopotamia, rebellion in Ireland, and the hasty withdrawal of a Cabinet measure submitted with desire to settle the grave question of recruiting. Candid friends, long depressed by conviction of the inevitableness of the fall of the Government, renewed their exhortation to find safety in reconstruction, preferably with the Premier shelved.

Within twenty-four hours the situation changed. Debate on Mr. Walter Long's motion to introduce a new Military Service bill made it clear that the measure had not a friend in the House, probably not excluding the Minister who in unusually halting tones

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressed its acceptance. It was open to the Government to stick to its bill, hoping that by concessions made here and there in committee its life might be saved. Mr. Asquith took the bolder and, as it proved, the wiser course. He did not hesitate or haggle. It happened that pressure of engagements kept him in his room behind the Speaker's chair while the debate went forward. News of the drift of events being carried to him, he hurriedly entered the House and, instantly grasping the situation, withdrew the bill, promising on the following day to introduce another, embodying the principle of compulsory service, universal within certain limitations of age.

This swift, dramatic movement has a close parallel in Parliamentary history. It is to be found on the historic occasion when, in 1867, Disraeli, leader in the House of Commons of a Tory party that had long successfully kept back the steadily advancing tide of demand for Parliamentary reform, suddenly accepted an amendment to his own bill which fully established the principle of household suffrage. The story is told by himself in a letter quoted by Mr. Buckle in his "Life," opportunely published. The amendment before the committee proposed to enfranchise the compound householder whose half-million votes were regarded with apprehension, not only by Tories, but by Liberals of the faith of Mr. Lowe. Disraeli, writing to Gathorne Hardy, described how he went down to the House in a state of doubt and of difficulty. "About nine o'clock, being quite alone on our bench, and only 45 men on our side, the amendment was moved. . . . I tried to get up some debate, but it was impossible. I waited until the question was put, when, having revolved everything in my mind, I felt that the critical moment had arrived when we might take a step that would destroy the present agitation and extinguish Gladstone & Co. I therefore accepted the spirit of the amendment." Thus in circumstances singularly identical in their course and surroundings were two momentous changes in the Constitution brought about. In one a Tory leader was instrumental in conferring household suffrage on the constituencies. In the other a Liberal Prime Minister announced acceptance of the long-resisted principle of compulsory military service.

Mr. Asquith's tardy surrender seems to point to the conclusion that Mr. Lloyd George was right when, so far back as last September, as he, without fear of the Order in Council, divulges, he advocated such a course. The question is at least arguable. It is by no means certain that, had the Government eight months ago plumped for compulsory service, it would at that time have had the approval of the House of Commons and the support of the country. Objection to conscription is deeply rooted in the British mind. A majority of the public was resolved that voluntaryism should at least have full opportunity of justifying itself. This was presented under most favorable circumstances by the patriotic endeavor of Lord Derby. When that failed, there was no alternative to compulsory service. The Cabinet, torn by internal dissensions, still hoped, to use a consecrated phrase, to be able to "muddle through" on, or somewhere about, the old lines. Hence Mr. Walter Long's bill. When the House of Commons took the matter into its own hands the Prime Minister recognized, doubtless not without a sigh of satisfaction, that the affair was settled, and yielded with alacrity that saved the life of his Government.

A remarkable feature of the situation is the absence of friction with which the revolutionary change has been accepted by Parliament and the country. Had it been so disposed, the House of Commons might as easily last September as in this month of May have forced the hand of a halting Government. The country at large gave no sign of conviction that compulsory service was the only way of winning the war. Both have from the first been determined that, at whatever cost in blood or money, the war shall be won. Convinced at last that voluntary service is inadequate to a task for ages successfully assigned to it, it without a murmur bends its neck to bear the yoke of compulsory service. The result of this notable *volte face* has been that the week has seen the new Military Service bill carried by overwhelming majorities under the auspices of a miraculously resuscitated Ministry.

EXPATRIATION OF JAPANESE ABROAD.

By ERNEST W. CLEMENT.

TOKIO, April 30.

Many who are interested in obtaining an equitable solution of American-Japanese problems have felt that the Japanese should not be denied the right of naturalization in the United States. On the other hand, the so-called anti-Japanese advocates have contended, with good reason, that Japan would not allow her subjects abroad to be expatriated—"once a Japanese, always a Japanese." They insisted that Japan would not permit Japanese abroad to be absolved from allegiance to their native land, and that Japanese, therefore, are not "assimilable." But now Japan has removed that obstacle by amending her "Law of Nationality" through the action of both houses of the Imperial Diet. Let us see what has been accomplished.

Mr. Gilbert Bowles, secretary of the American Peace Society of Japan, has prepared material on this topic for the next issue of the *Japan Peace Movement*, joint organ of that society and of the Japan Peace Society; and he kindly permits the use of that material from a duplicate copy of his manuscript.

In the first place, he points out a few of the principal provisions of the original law, which went into force on April 1, 1899, as follows:

"A child is a Japanese, if his or her father is a Japanese at the time of his or her birth," regardless of whether the child is born in Japan, in the United States, or in New Guinea.

"A child whose father is unknown or possesses no nationality is a Japanese, provided that his or her mother is a Japanese."

An alien, without distinction as to race or nationality, may acquire Japanese nationality: a woman, by marriage to any Japanese man; a man, by marriage to a Japanese woman who is the head of a house; by adoption into a Japanese family; by naturalization, if full twenty years of age, after having "a domicile in Japan for at least five years consecutively."

He then presents the following comparisons:

Old Law.	*Amendments.*
Article 18. A Japanese woman who has married an alien loses Japanese nationality.	*Article* 18. When a Japanese by becoming the wife of a foreigner has acquired the husband's nationality, then such Japanese loses (her) Japanese nationality.
Article 20. A person who has voluntarily acquired a foreign nationality loses Japanese nationality.	*Article* 20 *Bis*. In case a Japanese subject who has acquired foreign nationality by reason of his or her birth in a foreign country has domicile in that country, he or she may be expatriated with the permission of the Minister of State for Home Affairs. The application for the permission referred to in the preceding paragraph shall be made by the legal representative in case the person to be expatriated is younger than fifteen years of age. If the person in question is a minor above fifteen years of age, or a person adjudged incompetent, the application can only be made with the consent of his or her legal representative or guardian. A step-father, a step-mother, a legal mother, or a guardian may not make the application or give the consent prescribed in the preceding paragraph without the consent of the family council. A person who has been expatriated loses Japanese nationality.
Article 24. Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding five Articles, a male of full seventeen years or upwards does not lose Japanese nationality, unless he has completed active service in the Army or Navy, or he is under no obligation to enter into it. A person who actually occupies an official post—civil or military—does not lose Japanese nationality notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding six Articles until after he or she has lost such official post.	In Article 24 the words "foregoing five Articles" and the words "foregoing six Articles" shall respectively be replaced by the words "foregoing six Articles" and "foregoing seven Articles."
Article 26. A person who has lost Japanese nationality in accordance with Art. 20 or 21 may recover Japanese nationality, provided that he or she possesses a domicile in Japan; but this does not apply when the persons mentioned in Art. 16 have lost Japanese nationality. [The persons mentioned in Art. 16 are "naturalized persons, children of naturalized persons who have acquired Japanese nationality, and persons who have become adopted children of Japanese."]	In Article 26 after the words "Article 20" insert the words "Article 20 *Bis*." The following paragraph is added to Article 26: In case the person who has lost Japanese nationality in accordance with the provision of Article 20 *Bis* is younger than fifteen years of age, the application for the permission prescribed in the preceding paragraph shall be made by the father who is the member of the family to which such person belonged at the time of his expatriation. Should the father be unable to do so, the application shall be made by the mother; if the mother is unable to do so, then by the grandfather; and if the grandfather is unable to do so, then by the grandmother.

In response to a special request, Mr. T. Miyaoka, of the Tokio bar, has sent the following notes on the Amending act:

The amendment to article 18 requires no comment. The present article 18 provides that a Japanese woman loses Japanese nationality when she marries a foreigner. This is unsatisfactory, for unless the law of her husband's nationality confers upon her the nationality of the husband by marriage, the woman would be without any nationality

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever. The new article 18 remedies such anomaly.

The really important part, and the difficult point for foreigners to understand, is the legal effect of the new article inserted in the present law between article 20 and article 21. This new article is designated article 20 *bis* in order to escape the necessity of changing the designation of every article after article 20 and of changing the index number whenever any article after article 20 is referred to in the body of any other article.

Article 20 of the law, as it stands to-day, reads: "A person who has acquired a foreign nationality by his own choice loses Japanese nationality." This would be perfectly clear so long as one did not lose sight of the phrase "by his own choice," and provided further that the provisions of article 24 did not exist. Article 24 of the present law says, in effect, that a male Japanese of seventeen years of age or more does not lose Japanese nationality under the provisions of any of the preceding five (in the amended law instead of "five" read "six") articles, until he shall have served in the army or the navy or unless such individual for any reason is exempted from military service. In other words, a Japanese boy, if he is seventeen years old or more, must first discharge his military service before he can divest himself of Japanese nationality. Such provision remains unchanged in the new law.

The new article "turns round the corner," so to speak, by opening the road to the expatriation of male Japanese subjects before they attain the age of seventeen.

Under the conscription laws of the Empire, a boy of seventeen is already a soldier in the Japanese army, although his time of service under "colors" does not commence until he is twenty. A male Japanese from the age of seventeen is a part of the army until he completes his fortieth year. If he is an officer in the army, he is either in the active service, in the first reserve, the second reserve, or the national army, called the *landsturm*. If he is neither a commissioned officer nor a warrant officer, then he is a plain soldier in the *landsturm,* in the active service, in the reserve (*i. e.,* the first reserve), or in what the Germans call the *landwehr*. A boy is not called upon to serve under "colors," that is to say, he is not required to receive military training in regimental barracks, until he is twenty, but from seventeen to twenty he is already a soldier in the *landsturm.*

The Japanese Law of Nationality, as it stands to-day, and as it will stand when the amendatory law goes into operation, rests upon the principle that a Japanese soldier may not cease to be one by expatriating himself. This principle remains unchanged, but article 20 *bis* provides that a Japanese boy who has acquired a foreign nationality by reason of his birth in the territories of such country, provided he has domicile in that country, may divest himself of the Japanese nationality, if his father or other parental authority takes the necessary step for him before he is fifteen; or if he has attained the age of fifteen, he may take the same step with the consent of his father or other parental authority until he attains the age of seventeen.

In short, the object of the amendatory law is to permit the expatriation of Japanese boys born in Hawaii or in any of the States of the American Union before he is fifteen or at latest before he is seventeen.

At seventeen a Japanese boy, even though he was born in the United States, is enrolled in the register of the Japanese national army; for the Japanese law, like the laws of continental Europe and unlike the Anglo-American system, recognizes allegiance to the sovereign by reason of blood-descent, and not according to the place of birth. In the legal conception of continental Europe, no less than in that of Japan, the place of birth is a mere incident in the life of a man that does not affect the tie of allegiance which a man owes to the sovereign of his parents.

The new amendment to the Japanese Law of Nationality is a concession in favor of the Anglo-American territorial principle by a nation which has from time immemorial scrupulously observed the principles of personal sovereignty and personal allegiance.

. . . . . .

The material presented above has been given in considerable detail in order to set it clearly before those who are interested in this new phase of the relations between Japanese and Americans. It seems as if it would be only fair play for the United States to grant to Japanese the right of naturalization. Those Japanese who are sincere and earnest in their desire to make a permanent home in the States and to become Americans would seize the opportunity. That would make a reasonable test of assimilability. It is certainly unfair to expect Japanese to assimilate so long as they are denied rights and privileges that naturally tend to promote assimilation. The Japanese Government has shown its willingness to coöperate by this new Law of Nationality, which permits expatriation to a considerable extent. It only remains for the American Government to do its part by extending the right of naturalization to Japanese.

THE BEHAVIOR OF WAR—CRITICISM AMONG ALLIES.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, May 20.

My friend, the English correspondent, has a peck of woes. I hope he will not sell them to London papers, for they are the unhappiness of things which do not happen. This war has a behavior of its own—not deliberate, of course, but a spontaneous way of going on according to the habits, good or bad, of the fighting nations. It is a wonder that, where habits have been so diverse for centuries, there should be so little criticism back and forth among allies.

My friend's first woe is that Frenchmen do not appreciate the full extent of English effort in this war. He allows that the French are doing most fighting, and suffering most; but they do not seem to understand that England is going on towards the limit of possible effort in the common cause. As usual, Mr. Asquith and the French newspapers are at fault. "Why did not Asquith say long ago that we have 5,000,000 men in the work of war, and that we have contributed to the help of our allies 800,000,000, and perhaps 1,000,000,000 pounds sterling? And, now that he has given the figures, why do not the Paris papers publish them?"

I suggest that such figures dribble out in the English Parliament only occasionally, and not all at a time, but like vaseline from a compressible tube. I remember myself to have learned them, now one and now the other, from my Paris paper of the morning or the evening. We cannot expect journals, whose editions are like the life of certain gnats—but for a day—to put before their readers the statistics of many days. There must be the natural merging of many days' impressions into a general conclusion. And then a weekly review of Paris has actually taken up this question: What are the English really doing in this war? And Taine's nephew has written a book in sympathetic answer. No Englishman can complain, for the answer given is not at all confined to what was presupposed would be England's chief help:

> Rule, Britannia—Britannia, rule the waves—
> Britons never will be slaves.

My friend keeps up his grumbling. He does not wish Frenchmen to "patronize" the English army. I recall the whole-hearted appreciation shown in France after the battle of Mons and the victory of the Marne for the comparatively small English units which did the work of great bodies of troops. Afterwards, it is true, in the long leisure of a war which had become a siege of trenches, traditional French gayety laughed not unkindly at the baths and games and tea of the fresh English soldiers who came over by hundreds of thousands. But no French soldier denied that they died well when they got to the front. If there was the shadow of a criticism, it was rather the statement of a fact—they got themselves killed too easily, through lack of experienced training and officering.

With all their losses from infantry attacks and counter-attacks, the French, too, are having experience of new officers; but at least these have had their years of compulsory service in the ranks during peace. So long as there is one country which has organized itself into a professional war-machine, just so long countries which have not prepared their men for war will be at a disadvantage when that one country begins. This does not conclude to any obnoxious military conscription or "preparedness." There is an alternative—the destruction of the professional war-machine—and this is the object, the aim, the one end of French and English fighting together now.

My friend retreats but slowly from the first to the second, and then to the third line of his mental intrenchments. East is East, and West is West, and, to the generation which is no longer young nor receptive of new thought, French and English will never understand each other. "Why will the Paris newspapers not admit that, just as France is built up on Protection, so England is constituted by Free Trade? Why do they join in Northcliffe's campaign, which ought to be called a conspiracy?"

In vain I remark that, if Free Trade is in the English Constitution, all Lord Northcliffe's newspapers will never be able to conspire it out, any more than they could conjure Englishmen out of their skins. Plenty of economic and financial points of agreement can be found for the Allies after the war, without imposing cut-and-dried legislation of protective tariffs on England. Frenchmen speaking with authority greater than that of the daily newspapers of Paris—Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, Edmond Théry, Yves Guyot—have no illusion in this matter.

Inwardly, not to increase my friend's discontent, I recall that Free Trade has succeeded with modern England, in spite of the arguments of its founders having lost much

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their application with the changes of time. It works for other reasons, in connection with England's mastery of sea-carrying trade. In the same way, John Stuart Mill was very sure that no country would profit substantially by tourist travellers spending their money in it. His arguments read well, but they take no account of the changes made by the gold standard of our day. So, in spite of Mill's arguing, the gold in which tourists' expenses are ultimately paid has been the prosperity of Switzerland, and has repaired the damaged finances of Italy, and has been doing so for Spain, and will help France to pay England's advances when war is over and past. What a satisfactory book of political economy might be written from principles that have succeeded where their arguments failed!

It is something for Englishmen, who have not the reputation of thin skins, to have been reduced by war to the sensitiveness of the travelling American when subjected to foreign criticism. Like the country boy going up to London, it bursts their birth's invidicus bond for them—and this promises to be not the least beneficial effect of this war. The benefit is not limited to Englishmen.

I had in my pocket a number of one of those great newspapers of Milan—among the most serious and best informed of all Europe. Two columns of the front page were given to an article entitled "L'Italia assente." It really dealt with neutrals, but it applies equally to a lack of understanding among allies of what Italy, too, is doing in the war. "Outside her own boundaries, Italy is always absent. Her war, in its reasons and interests and conduct, is unknown or ill-known, falsified, or undervalued. And moral and material preparation for her after the war is abandoned to Divine Providence."

The writer had been in Greece, Servia, and in *tedescata* (Germanified) Bulgaria and friendly Rumania, in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Everywhere it was the same story, or, rather, lack of stories. Even the cinemas showed no films of Italy in war. At the sight of photographs where Italian soldiers hold out amid Alpine rocks and snows against Austrian batteries, winning Italia Irredenta by inches, with labor and wounds and death, there was a gasp of astonishment, if not incredulity. Something of this might be observed in France, although Italian illustrated journals are sold at the Paris stands, and tragic pictures are often reproduced.

It is hard for one people in the anguish of its struggle for life to realize similar conflicts that are far away. The same would be true of Russia's conduct of the war, if it had not been for Grand Duke Nicholas furnishing us with recurrent surprises. The Italian correspondent writes: "Say to those good people of Rome that they must provide at once, with energy, without counting expense, for the propaganda of our war."

In the United States, the French have also laid themselves open to the same criticism—they have not been as alive as their enemy to propagate their side of the war, and their war news. The Germans were already in time of peace past masters in advertising themselves. Here, too, may be one of the compensations of this war, if compensation there can be. Englishmen may become sensitized to foreign opinion, and Frenchmen may learn to look abroad—and Italians and Russians and all the multitudinous allies may sail into the world's new day holding hands together.

Control of Diplomacy

By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.

When Europe found itself before the plain of Armageddon, in the time of the pale horse unforetold, there were some standing forth to proclaim that a potent cause of this universal woe was the vice and inevitable failure of diplomacy done without assent of the people. Complaint was most insistent in England, which has most of parliamentary government. Men said that in Whitehall was the most conspicuous survival of that aristocratic and feudal prerogative which had once characterized all government. Gradually the Lords had lost the power which mediæval privilege conferred upon them, the King had yielded his authority to Cabinet, Cabinet was merged in the House of Commons, and in some measure Commons had finally come to represent the wishes of citizens and to be responsible to them. In all departments of government save one there had been increasing trend towards democracy, but from this rule the singular and striking exception was management of foreign affairs. In England the conduct of diplomacy was in the hands of one man, or at most of a small group, working secretly and unhampered, not only uncontrolled by the people in Parliament, but acting without cognizance of Parliament, perhaps in contravention of its wishes.

This dark secrecy and this authority unchecked were monstrous in themselves, but it was worse that the character and the point of view of those who manned the diplomatic service were not in harmony with the spirit coming to prevail in other quarters. Most often British diplomacy was in the hands of able men, but always they were aristocrats, carrying on intercourse with men like themselves in other nations. Great men acting as seemed best to them in the secrecy of a seclusion into which Parliament and people must not pry dwelt as in a world apart, a world of their own, at a distance regarding the multitude of men and women whose destinies they decided, and knowing but vaguely and indistinctly the feelings of their hearts. There was not only this distance and aloofness, but in so far as they did not consider people impersonally like pawns in their game of high politic, they saw things merely with the view of an upper class long wont to rule a lower. They had no actual understanding of democracy and could have little sympathy with it. So the people were bound by decisions which they had not made, their fate was in the keeping of masters whom they could not control, they were committed to wars which they had not foreseen and which they had not desired, and which even in event of victory destroyed a great deal that was most precious to them.

It was difficult to say what changes to make. Were foreign affairs by their nature such that they could not be yielded to popular control? Like objection had been loudly cried in every campaign for the extension of the franchise and whenever it had been proposed to subject executive or prerogative to restraint. There was more truth in the contention that diplomacy required a swiftness and a secrecy not to be found in large bodies. But, it was said, something could be done. In the United States there was partial check by the legislative through committees of foreign affairs and the power of the Senate. In England there should be more publicity, more reference of policy and diplomatic business to the nation, and no treaty should be made or understanding arranged without approbation of Parliament. No doubt the actual conduct of foreign affairs should be left largely to the Foreign Secretary, and he be allowed to manage details in the various stages at his discretion and as seemed well to him, but always he must be supervised and counselled and controlled by an efficient and powerful committee chosen from Parliament.

I.

How much of this should be, and how much is, possible? Are these schemes cherished by enthusiasts working for the world's good, or are they only the dreams of visionaries who would have change, and insist on it, but know not how it shall be brought to pass? Perhaps one may not say. I can add nothing that is constructive. But some years ago, in a manner entirely antiquarian and academic, my attention was directed to this matter as it had come up before in the past. In the days before the war I studied the development of the Cabinet in England; and looking back now beyond the things which have happened since then, which have been sadness and horror even for a non-combatant safe and far away, I remember with a sense of old-time places the Round Room of the Public Record Office and the vast silence of the British Museum, where in journals of Parliament, in faded manuscripts, and in pamphlets long at rest may be read the story of a like design attempted once and long continued before failure was confessed.

In England by ancient law the management of foreign affairs was vested altogether in the Crown. Occasionally, after a while, the magnates and commons were consulted in Parliament, but as a rule diplomacy was managed by the King and conducted in his private council. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Royalists and opponents fought out a long constitutional struggle which was essentially a contest between Parliament and Crown for supremacy in the governance of the realm. In the course of that contest, which is marked particularly by the Puritan triumphs, the Revolution of 1688, and the somnolence of the early Hanoverians, one victory after another was obtained by Parliament, until it had annexed the power of legislation, control of money, and even the management of finance, the thoroughness of this triumph being lessened only by the fact that while these preroga-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives were wrested altogether from the King, they were taken over partly by the Cabinet, which had not as yet coalesced with the House of Commons, as in the future it was destined to do. In one respect, however, the failure of Parliament was marked and in the end complete: from the time of James I it had sought to share in diplomatic management and then to control it, and through most of the reign of Charles II it had struggled ardently to accomplish this; but a generation afterwards found it baffled, and the days of Walpole and Newcastle saw the abandonment of the effort, which was understood then to be hopeless.

When the Commons sought to advise Elizabeth about her marriage, a matter as important as anything affecting their time, she rebuffed them. A courtier of James I told Parliament: his Majesty is "not tied to give account of his actions to any but to God." Particularly after the Restoration, Commons attempted to encroach upon royal prerogative by advising the King to make certain alliances in the interest of the nation but against his inclination for France, and by bidding him declare war when they thought it well. It was admitted by some advocates of such policy that these things had always been strictly within the jurisdiction of the Crown, but since Commons were asked to furnish supplies for maintaining the King's arrangements, they should of right have some voice in settling them. In 1677 the House asserted that it was not in conformity with parliamentary usage to grant money for alliances and for wars before they were communicated to Parliament; and a little later Charles, goaded to anger, declared that if he suffered the Crown's fundamental prerogative of making peace and war so far to be invaded as to allow the conduct of foreign affairs to be prescribed by Parliament, then he would signify little more than the empty sound of a King.

Gradually, however, the contest came to be not so much between Parliament and King as between the supporters of the Ministry and its opponents, or one political party and the other. In the latter half of the seventeenth century and in the early years of the eighteenth two political factions developed into organizations firmly established and clearly distinct from each other; and the circumstances of the accession of the Hanoverians made it no longer possible for the Crown to govern the realm at the head of both of them, as had been the ideal of William and to some extent the principle followed by Anne. For more than half a century after 1714 a party whose characteristic was principally Whig dominated the Government, and was confronted by an Opposition partly composed of Tories.

Meanwhile, also, foreign affairs had been taken more and more from kings by the small, effective part of the Privy Council, which from secret committee or cabal developed into Cabinet and Ministry, and which in the time of George I took control of foreign affairs almost as much as of other powers, at the same time that it assumed the leadership of the dominant party in Parliament. The contest now came to be one between Ministry and parliamentary Opposition, and it is this aspect which characterizes the eighteenth century. From time to time Parliament wished to influence the course of diplomatic proceedings, and more often desired information about what had been done, and also the privilege of examining the papers pertinent. Ordinarily, the party in power would submit to the wishes and discretion of the Ministers; but not so the Opposition. And the parliamentary debates contain numerous suggestions about diplomacy or strictures thereupon, and the journals are filled with motions that papers and memorials relating to negotiations be laid before the Houses, with divisions registered denying the petitions, or with notices that his Majesty would cause the records to be submitted.

II.

This attempt of Parliament to participate in foreign affairs and supervise them was not successful. The dominant party soon came to submit patiently to the guidance of the Ministry, which was itself ruled by an inner circle of the Cabinet, so that the real management of diplomacy was in the hands of very few; and this acquiescence continued so entire that in the development of English constitutional law not only conduct of foreign affairs, but even power to conclude treaties, remained a prerogative of the Crown, exercised on the advice of a responsible Minister, with only treaties involving supply or a change in the law of the land to be made effective by statute. True, it long remained a favorite expedient of the Opposition desiring to embarrass a Ministry to begin discussion of foreign matters and call for papers and information; but in the nineteenth century, as party differences came to be almost entirely about domestic affairs, even this fell into abeyance, and diplomacy and international relations were finally left to the Foreign Office and to a part of the Cabinet Council. In 1886 it was moved in the Commons:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is not just or expedient to embark in war, contract engagements involving grave responsibilities for the Nation, and add territories to the Empire without the knowledge and consent of Parliament.

But nothing came of it then or afterwards.

The reasons advanced formerly were the same as those so frequently urged at the present time—namely, that diplomacy, to be effective, must be secret, sure, swift, and in the hands of the experienced and expert, or national interests cannot be conserved. Often statesmen averred that parliamentary management would trench upon wise precedent and the ancient prerogative of the Crown, but more often they said, what is said now, that diplomacy must be executed by few and not entrusted to many. In 1734, during a debate upon the Treaty of Seville, Sir William Yonge asserted:

> This House has a power of calling for Papers, yet we ought in no case to call for those Papers which may contain secrets, the publishing whereof might be of signal disadvantage to the commonwealth; I believe it will be granted, that a secret communicated once to this House, is in great danger of not remaining long a secret.

A few years later Walpole said:

> All matters relating to peace and war, besides the secrecy that is requisite, are liable to so many changes, and to such sudden and unlooked for alterations, that nothing but a single person, or an assembly that is continually subsisting, can be exactly informed of every incident that occurs, or can have such a thorough knowledge of foreign affairs, as to be able to foresee the lucky or the cross incidents that may probably occur, so as to take an immediate advantage of the former, or so as to take such measures as may prevent the dangerous consequences of the latter. Therefore while our happy constitution remains entire, while the Parliament meets but once a year, and does not continue assembled above three or four months in the twelve, it is impossible for either House of Parliament to intermeddle, much less to prescribe to the crown, in any affairs relating to peace or war, without exposing the nation to imminent danger.

"No Minister," declared Pelham, "who has a due regard to the prerogatives of the crown, will ever court the Parliament to intermeddle in any treaty of peace before it is concluded." And in 1754, during the debate on the address of thanks, the Attorney-General said:

> Other courts conceal their resolutions till they are just ready to act; but nothing can be concealed that passes in this House. . . . For this reason our constitution . . . has wisely lodged the power of peace and war solely in the crown.

III.

In America, once, there was an attempt to conduct foreign affairs under parliamentary supervision. The government of the revolted colonies was organized without an executive, and executive work had to be done by committees of Congress. In 1775 there was a Committee of Secret Correspondence, which two years later was changed to the Committee for Foreign Affairs. But conducting diplomatic intercourse through committees proved most unsatisfactory; members did not attend, and business was ill-transacted. In 1781 a permanent department was instituted under a Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Much of the actual management, however, was retained by Congress, wherein under the Articles of Confederation the exclusive power to make treaties was vested; and in 1782 it was expressly provided that

> All letters to sovereign powers, letters of credence, plans of treaties, conventions, manifestoes, instructions, passports, safe conducts, and other acts of Congress relative to the department of foreign affairs, when the substance thereof shall have been previously agreed to in Congress, shall be reduced to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form in the office of foreign affairs, and submitted to the opinion of Congress, and when passed, signed and attested, sent to the office of foreign affairs to be countersigned and forwarded.

As the general inefficiency of government under the Confederation became more evident, the evil of such management of diplomatic affairs did not fail to be noticed. In the plan which he submitted to the Convention in 1787 Hamilton proposed that an Executive should have the power of making treaties with the advice and approbation of a Senate. In the debates which attended the formation of the Constitution, confining the work of supervision to the Senate was objected to as a dangerous tendency towards aristocracy; but the idea finally prevailed that committing diplomacy to the keeping of a large assembly would be fatal to secrecy and swift operation. Jay, writing in the *Federalist*, explained this:

It seldom happens in the negotiation of treaties, of whatever nature, but that perfect *secrecy* and immediate *despatch* are sometimes requisite. There are cases where the most useful intelligence may be obtained, if the persons possessing it can be relieved from apprehensions of discovery. Those apprehensions will operate on those persons whether they are actuated by mercenary or friendly motives; and there doubtless are many of both descriptions, who would rely on the secrecy of the President, but who would not confide in that of the Senate, and still less in that of a large popular Assembly. The convention have done well, therefore, in so disposing of the power of making treaties, that although the President must, in forming them, act by the advice and consent of the Senate, yet he will be able to manage the business of intelligence in such a manner as prudence may suggest.

And Hamilton, arguing against the admission of the House of Representatives to a share in the formation of treaties, said:

The fluctuating and, taking its future increase into account, the multitudinous composition of that body, forbid us to expect in it those qualities which are essential to the proper execution of such a trust. Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, *secrecy*, and despatch, are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous. The very complication of the business, by introducing a necessity of the concurrence of so many different bodies, would of itself afford a solid objection. The greater frequency of the calls upon the House of Representatives, and the greater length of time which it would often be necessary to keep them together when convened, to obtain their sanction in the progressive stages of a treaty, would be a source of so great inconvenience and expense as alone ought to condemn the project.

After the adoption of the Constitution the President at first made a practice of consulting the Senate before beginning diplomatic negotiations, but this after a while was given over or rarely done. At the beginning of the twentieth century, except for the ratification of treaties, diplomacy in general was in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State, assisted at most by a small group of confidential advisers. Little was explained and little was afterwards published about our participation in the Conference of Algeciras; and it was asserted recently that during the progress of our negotiations with Germany the destiny of the United States was entirely in the keeping of President Wilson.

IV.

Some among those who desire to abolish the greater part of secret diplomacy, which they say is unnecessary, and to subject all diplomatic business to control of representatives of the people, realize that the handling of foreign affairs and much of the process of negotiation must be in the hands of some single executive officer, and that the conduct of this business must usually be left to him unhindered by the body instituted for his control. Some admit that a large legislative assembly, through which democracy can best make felt its power, is not fitted to participate in foreign intercourse or diplomatic detail. They do not so much desire democratic conduct of foreign affairs as democratic control: that no important action be consummated and no important policy entered upon without assent of the representatives of the people; this control to be maintained by means of a parliamentary committee of foreign affairs. None of the parliamentary committees now existing in the various civilized countries seems wholly satisfactory, yet in the development of a competent supervisory body the hope for improvement seems to lie. Always the method of working out this principle is beset with difficulties which appear nearly insurmountable. If a supervisory committee is to exercise real power in the interests of democracy, then it would seem, as things at present are, that it must surrender its secrecy and lose its precision and dispatch; if it is to act effectively in difficult situations, then it must be small and keep its counsel, and allow little participation by the larger body which it represents, a situation not essentially unlike that which prevails at present. The most ardent reformers admit that there would often be necessity for it to refrain from interference altogether. One does not abandon hope that great changes for the better may be made hereafter, but contemplation of the present and study of the past, if they reveal abuses, show also that most probably the changes must be effected slowly and partially over a long period of time, and will result in the end more from general amelioration of character and intellect of the masses of mankind than from any system of reform, however specious and excellent it may seem.

Meanwhile it may be doubted whether secret diplomacy and the management of foreign business as at present conducted are responsible for all the evil credited to them. Cabinet Ministers have resigned because, they said, without their knowledge things had been done which they would never have sanctioned had they known them; and some have ascribed the present war to the machinations of statesmen acting without the knowledge and without the consent of their people. Some believe that there would have been no conflict if diplomats in Paris, in Petrograd, and in London had not spun about Germany a web from which at last she strove to burst her way free; and that the peoples of England and France at least, had they realized this, would never have tolerated the silent construction of such an Entente Cordiale and such a Triple Entente. At best this is a superficial estimate of the causes of the struggle. The real factors were not diplomatic or dynastic, but the result of immense moral and intellectual changes and tremendous economic readjustments. Diplomats and rulers could do something to hasten the operation of these causes and something to avert them, but most probably in a larger sense their principal function was to recognize the existence of these causes before they had become visible to the peoples whom they affected. And I believe that a true estimate would show that, far from bringing on the catastrophe in which now England, France, and Russia are suffering, it is owing to the work of Isvolsky, Delcassé, and Edward VII that the Teutonic alliance in 1914 was unable to deal with Russia, France, and England separately, as Prussia dealt with Denmark, Austria, and France in the preceding generation.

Notes from the Capital

JAMES ROBERT MANN.

If you met James Robert Mann, of Illinois, in the street without suspecting his identity, you would probably take him for a plain business man pretty well on in years, who had been working a little too hard and was feeling the effect of it. The grizzled gray of his hair, beard, and moustache conveys a suggestion of shagginess, in spite of their being always scrupulously well cared for; his complexion lacks transparency; his eyes, though not conspicuously deep-set, lie far enough back to look not quite wholesome, and this suggestion is augmented by the brows and lashes that compass them. But there is nothing worn-out about Mann when you see him on the floor of the House and in action; there he shows a quickness of apprehension and a keenness of expression that would put many a younger man to his trumps to match.

As a minority leader, Mann is capable, but full of faults. For one thing, he is unsympathetic by nature, and is only spasmodically tactful. Here is where he embodies a notable contrast with Mr. Cannon, for instance, and Mr. Dingley, both of whom were markedly human in their handling of the responsibilities of leadership. Cannon, with his eccentricities of phrase, could give even a plainly hostile act a semi-humorous twist; while Dingley, with his absolute lack of humor in himself and his inability to appreciate it in anybody else, would sometimes disarm the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fiercest foe by his kindly seriousness. Mann more resembles Payne in his attitude towards the other side of the House, though he is as spirited as Payne was ponderous. That is what causes so much surprise at his occasional failures of discrimination in deciding what items shall, and what shall not, receive the party's support. It seems as if anything new to his knowledge shall for that cause be held under suspicion, or even condemned without an adequate hearing. Hence, as to most progressively novel measures, Mann's downright opposition can be counted on with considerable certainty till greater familiarity with the subject or the logic of an opponent's argument has convinced him that he is headed in the wrong direction. Such a change in his own mind, however, does not necessarily draw any verbal admission from him.

Thanks to this trait, Mann, while ambitious to be, and to be recognized as, a severe economist, is as likely as not to obstruct such a piece of legislation as a project for consolidating the work of two Government departments in the same field; for his fear of a new idea which involves a little unaccustomed present expense, and may develop into an entering wedge for more new things, blinds him to the saving which must be effected eventually through keeping two groups of men from going over the same ground twice. He is so close a scrutinizer of bills and resolutions, and so "cranky" on any which squint in the direction of a personal interest, that he has succeeded to the title which used to be applied to the late William S. Holman, of Indiana—the Great Objector. Other members were wont to resent Holman's interference with their projects, but not with the bitterness with which they come back at Mann. Holman, when thus made a target, had a habit of sinking into himself like a telescope, dropping down on the base of his spine, and staring silently into vacancy while his critics held the floor; Mann, on the contrary, almost always hits back, as if the attack had stung him and he wished to make his assailants regret their temerity.

Wherever you hear Mann discussed as a lawmaker, you will hear strong emphasis laid upon his industrious habits. In one sense this is a deserved compliment, but what has won it for him is not so much his industry as his methodical ways. Other men may be just as industrious without getting so much credit for it, because their manner of work includes a great deal of waste effort. Mann eliminates waste so far as practicable by making everything subject to a system. He is very rarely, indeed, caught unprepared when any subject comes up in the House. Of course, he has the initial advantage over many of his associates on the floor of having had nearly twenty years' experience in Federal legislation, so that he knows the Congressional machine in every wheel and rod and joint; but in addition to this, he has formed a habit of classifying and pigeonholing, so to speak, whatever fact or figure comes his way. A bill that gets past the mere introductory stage is glanced over by his competent clerks, who lay it before him annotated in various lines; and by keeping abreast of what they have predigested—a task in which a strong and well-trained memory proves of immeasurable assistance—he is ready, the moment any one calls the bill up on the floor, to arm himself for its support or denunciation. Moreover, he utilizes the odd moments which most other men treat as negligible for keeping up broadly with the progress of the world. The Library of Congress knows him as an incessant if not actually an omnivorous reader, and he reads with such rapidity that there is a constant flow of new books through his office. Here his memory comes into active play again, though it retains for him more generalities than details.

It is not often that Mann gives his stalwart partisanship a long enough rest to speak approvingly of the conduct or opinions of any dangerous Democrat. Even when he follows an amiable tradition of the House so far as to pass a pleasant comment upon his dearest official foe, the Speaker, he does it in a manner which leaves no doubt that his compliments have their origin in respect for precedent rather than in the promptings of the heart. Possibly this explains why Mr. Clark, when he wishes to say something agreeable to the Republicans, seems to prefer dwelling reminiscently on Cannon's virtues to paying a more up-to-date tribute to Mann's.

TATTLER.

Correspondence

COL. ROOSEVELT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The *Nation* barely deigns to reply to the onslaughts of the Colonel's backers, so mayhap it will permit me to propound three queries which have occurred to me from time to time.

Why should the worshippers of a demigod. (I fear for my life because of the use of the "demi") resent so bitterly any suggestion of disapprobation if they are so certain of the omniscience of the object of their worship? Would not a show of quiet contempt (such, for example, as the *Nation's* towards them) be more in keeping with their accustomed attitude of adoration? Is it their idea that the persistent use of vindictive vituperation entitles the user to absolute immunity from the faintest suggestion of dispraise?

All of which is respectfully submitted from the confines of the bomb-proof cyclone cellar to which I have retired until the above blows over.

M. TOSCAN BENNETT.

Hartford, Conn., June 2.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There is a touch of the ludicrous in the efforts of some of your readers to shield the doughty Colonel from the vials of your wrath. Since when, one may wonder, has his own mildness and magnanimity warranted such consideration in return? "All good citizens" will, of course, resent your criticism, but there must be among your readers a large number of milksops, mollycoddles, poltroons, etc., who have squirmed under the Colonel's copious vocabulary of epithets for those whose views chance to differ from his own divine dispensation, and who will hail your vicarious services with unmitigated joy.

How can effective political opposition to Mr. Roosevelt be other than a direct and vigorous attack on his character and personality? It is his character and personality that constitute the reason for being of the erstwhile Progressive Party, the basis of the present claim that the country is in imperative need of his guidance, and, in the writer's opinion, one of the gravest dangers to the republic to-day. So far as Mr. Roosevelt figures politically, his faults of temperament and flaws of character are the vital issue. To understand the tremendous influence he has in the past exerted over the American people, one has only to realize the extraordinary change that has come over the nation since he was Chief Executive, and to think of the emotional excitement, bellicose volubility, and violence with which we should have met our recent difficulties had he still occupied the Presidential chair. As for sideline criticism of our active political leaders, to which one of your correspondents so strenuously objects, one may inquire what Mr. Roosevelt has done but talk unceasingly and criticise unsparingly for the last seven years.

My object, however, is not to support the personal views expressed in the preceding paragraph, or to justify the *Nation's* opposition to Mr. Roosevelt, but rather to uphold its general policy of frank and free-spoken criticism in political and other fields. It is the refreshing and distinctive characteristic of the *Nation* that it speaks the truth as it sees it, with its eye undistracted by figures of circulation and its ear not too close to the ground to catch the echoes of popular assent. The American tendency to take things humorously and good-naturedly, to adopt an attitude of tolerant indifference, to blur the sharp distinctions between right and wrong, is responsible for some of the shoddy elements in our political life. This, fortunately, is not the attitude of the *Nation*. Its manner of attacking Mr. Roosevelt may not be shrewd editorial policy. Conceivably, it may even drive some constitutional dissenters into the opposite camp. But one may wonder, in all conscience, what impression academic reasoning and mild words could make on Mr. Roosevelt's present followers, fed as they have long been on perfervid rhetoric, and excited by the chronic heat and fury of their commander-in-chief.

A. F. W.

Washington, D. C., May 27.

THE IRISH EXECUTIONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: As at once an admirer of Mr. Howells's art and a sharer of his view that too many Irish insurgents were executed, may I protest against his rather conventional utterance that not they but the Ulster loyalists are "rebels"? There is nothing opprobrious in the name, which is almost a recognized term of honor; but surely one need not defy language, law, and fact to express sympathy. To "rebel" against your government, not to be rid of it, but to prevent its ridding itself of you, is really the most extraordinary performance in history or juristics. The Sinn Feiners may have been forgivable, though it comes hard to forgive clasping the gory hands of Belgium's harriers to bring the like on English neighbors; but they were trying to throw off their government and the Ulstermen were trying to keep it, in place of being handed over to one they fear, hate, and despise. Perhaps they are wrong to feel thus; perhaps they ought to risk something to end an unsatisfactory condition; but why talk topsyturvily?

One thing more: Why refuse to see in Ireland what is admitted in other annexes, that the *net* result is the rightful reward of a long and honest effort to deal fairly with the people? Why put all the italics on the little sore left and none on the great sore

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

healed? A century ago all Celtic Ireland would have joined the rising had they dared; fifty years ago a good part would at least have sympathized. Now a few thousand rise, and the rest think them as senseless in what they wish as what they do. A few bomb-throwers in India, a few rioters in Egypt, a few insurgents in South Africa are rightly thought of no weight compared with the rallying of the grand mass to support a better government than anything likely in exchange. What is the fairness of shutting one's eyes to the same thing in Ireland? What seems to me significant is, not that a few men still find more pleasure in an emotional debauch over long past grievances than in patiently working for present advantage, but that so few are left to do it. Take out the strike element, and how many represent this Rip Van Winkleism? A few more than here would fight England now for the Stamp act. But if any one says that was a reason for cool policy, I shall not deny it. Only let us not forget a great city near ruin and hundreds of its innocent citizens slain for this wicked dreaming. There is a certain grade of folly which all law holds equivalent to crime, and this *was* crime.

FORREST MORGAN.

Hartford, May 28.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Howells's condemnation of the British Government for the shooting of the Irish prisoners would have some force in the case of an ordinary national uprising. But if the punishment of rebellion is ever to be death, as every state has hitherto agreed it should be, I think so strong a case for the infliction of the capital sentence has never existed. Consider these facts: (1.) The uprising in no sense represented the feeling of the Irish people, but was bitterly condemned by all except a tiny handful, including the loyal soldiers fighting at the front as volunteers. (2.) It was a stab in the back, made at a time when Irish self-government had already been placed upon the statute book, and made in alliance with a nation fighting all that civilization holds dear. (3.) It cost the lives of several hundred men, including British soldiers and officers treacherously murdered before they were aware that a revolt was in progress, and women and boys as well, shot down by snipers in the streets.

Mr. Howells's condemnation is really a condemnation of civilized government. That is an academic problem which does not enter into discussion here. If ever murder deserves the death sentence, it deserved it in the case of Pearse, Connolly, etc.

V. R. E.

Quebec, May 25.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your article on the Irish executions in your issue of May 11 expresses a view that was certain to find a voice in a portion of the press, and not in this country only. You disapprove of the executions on the ground of inexpediency. But your article, moderate in tone as it was, has called forth from no less eminent an American than Mr. William Dean Howells a letter so violent in character that I feel that it cannot be allowed to go unanswered. Mr. Howells says that it seems to him that your readers "ought not to assent tacitly, but that each of them has a duty to speak out in approval of what you have said." Will you give the publicity of your columns to the expression of disapproval of what Mr. Howells has said from an Irishman who has never sported a hyphen?

The first act of violence in the Dublin outbreak was when thirteen Sinn Feiners walked quietly to the lower gate of Dublin Castle. The policeman on duty put up his hand to show that there was no passage. Instantly one of the thirteen shot the policeman dead. Later in the same day, while some of the insurgents were digging trenches in St. Stephen's Green and a puzzled and half-amused populace was looking on, a Sinn Feiner shot to death a drayman who was slow in obeying an order to stop his team.* In the more organized fighting that ensued during the following days the fatal casualties in the Government forces—including many Irish soldiers, constabulary, and policemen—were considerably over one hundred, and there were several hundreds of wounded. Scores of innocent non-combatants are believed to have lost their lives. Does Mr. Howells seriously believe that the leaders of this outbreak should be treated as prisoners of war and confined in the comfortable camps where England keeps her enemies? I can hardly think that this is his view. If it is, he will find it difficult to escape from the logical extreme that any murderer of a soldier or policeman can claim the rights of a belligerent by setting up the plea of "patriotism." If it is not, then it would be interesting to know just what degree of punishment Mr. Howells would consider fit to meet the case. Imprisonment? Well, Mr. Howells's knowledge of human nature must tell him that there are many high-hearted men who would prefer to stand against a wall and be shot to death rather than to suffer a long term of imprisonment. But imprisonment would avoid bloodshed! True enough, and thereby the squeamish would be spared a shock. I confess that in these days, when a million of the most useful lives in Europe have been spent like water to stay the steps of the Hun on the soil of France, I feel very little squeamishness about a little blood more or less on the flags of the Castle Yard, or wherever those executions took place. And I do not think that Mr. Howells's charge of vengeance can be sustained. The military authorities had an undoubted legal right to try by court-martial and put to death, if found guilty, every man taken with arms in his hands. I do not suggest that they would have been morally justified in doing so; but I do suggest that among so many hundreds of prisoners so small a proportion as fourteen death sentences carried out savors of leniency rather than of the "vengeance" which Mr. Howells deplores.

The Government evidently was in possession of all the facts before the outbreak. Sir Matthew Nathan, then Under Secretary for Ireland, gives the exact figures in his evidence before the Royal Commission. There were 15,200 men in the Sinn Fein forces, but they had only 1,886 rifles and pistols, of which 825 were in Dublin. Disarmament was not attempted, from a desire to avoid bloodshed. This is undoubtedly the same reason that weighed with the Government two years earlier, when they refrained from making any serious attempt to disarm those other potential rebels, the Carsonites, of Ulster. In this more recent case they may well have believed the probability of an outbreak remote. Arms were expected from Germany, but the navy could be depended on to frustrate their landing. And an assault on the British Empire with 1,886 rifles and pistols was, no doubt, to them unthinkable. On this view the governors of Ireland staked their reputations and their professional careers, and lost. But at least it was not they who chose the path of bloodshed.

Armed rebellion against an existing government has always been punishable as a capital offence. Therein lies its heroism, if any it has. The Sinn Feiners knew this as well as any one; and, if I know my countrymen, they would not have had it otherwise. You have got to play the game. These men were playing for a great stake and for much glory. You cannot have the glamour and the heroics and claim clemency as a right. It is the playing of this game and the losing of it that has made "martyrs" in the past. Posterity has been willing to forget the crudeness of the plan, the poverty of means, the halting action, and to remember only the selfless devotion to a noble dream, the willingness to sacrifice, the manful facing of the final penalty. That is why even poor Smith O'Brien (he of the "battle in the cabbage garden") has his statue in Dublin and why Robert Emmet has a more enduring monument in the songs of his countrymen. But the Sinn Feiners are not in that category, for they have been faithless to their mistress, that Liberty whom they have sung and preached. They have struck hands with the Powers of Darkness; they have called to their alliance that arch-enemy of freedom—the same that has set his heel on the civilian populations of Belgium and of Poland, a heel that is still grinding. For that reason when martyrs' crowns come to be passed round there will be "none for the brows" of Messrs. Pearse and Connolly and their wild-eyed crew of dreamers.

The people of the British Empire are waging a war on behalf of civilization, and they are waging it with clean hands. I am willing to grant that they are also fighting for their own interests, for that is only to say that their interests are on the side of the angels. In that mighty struggle they would like to have the understanding and the sympathy of all good Americans, among whom we must certainly count Mr. Howells. And one may still hope that a mature reflection and a more careful balancing of the facts will convince him that the execution of the Sinn Feiners was something else than the "madness of English resentment."

C. M. O'DONEL.

Bell Ranch, N. M., May 24.

*The narrative of the editor of the *Irish Times*, written for the London *Times*. He states that one of his reporters witnessed the first of these incidents.

AMERICAN "ISOLATION."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The remark of your correspondent signing himself "A Mere Student" that the European Powers and Japan do not take kindly to our control of the only waterway across the Americas causes one to inquire whether we are isolated from the rest of the world to the extent that some believe. Just what will we do if they write us a joint note asking that we dismount the guns? Some sentimental people will say that Germany or England, as the case may be, would not fight us; but the Germans are loudly talking revenge, and all our worst wars have been among British people. Moreover, as many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our leaders seem not to know, for any nation to plan a navy "incomparably the largest" is always considered a casus belli by the people of the British Isles.

It is only by putting oneself in the other man's place that one can understand international relations. If all the American people were living in the thirteen original States, there would be more land per capita than is the case in the Japanese Islands. If we were so confined and the Japanese refused to admit us to the broad acres to the west, is there anything in our history which indicates that we would sit idly by and allow them to exclude us? Rather we would take up arms and form alliances, such as Washington's alliance with France. The fact that the Japanese are doing this does not entitle us to declaim against them as an inferior race.

Just at present they hold the whip-hand in diplomacy. They have done little in the war, but had they been allied with Germany they would quickly have overrun Australia with their millions, and England could have done nothing to prevent it. British statesmen are not likely to forget this lesson that an alliance with a Pacific naval Power is essential to the integrity of the Empire. There are only two such Powers—Japan and the United States. This country prefers to form no alliance except with South America, so that for some time past Great Britain has been looking for a way to meet the new demands of the Japanese. They might offer them a free hand in the Philippines, but that is a tropical region. Australia and New Zealand are out of the question. So that the only territory left on the Pacific is in South America. The British could intimate (perhaps they are doing so) that the Monroe Doctrine is no concern of theirs. What else have they to offer? There is little question that the Japanese could form an alliance with Germany, Italy, France, or some other naval Power for the conquest.

Is there anything of alarmism or Jingoism about this? We know that the Japanese military power—perhaps to-day more efficient than the German—has not been developed for purposes of national defence, for the simple reason that Japan has nothing that any one wants. We know that Japanese good-will is a vital necessity to the British Empire. We know that England can only retain this good-will by making a substantial offer. Practically the only assumption is that Sir Edward Grey would rather have them colonize in South America than in Australia.

From the British standpoint this procedure would have the advantage of bringing about the destruction of the threatening American navy without the loss of a single British warship. Moreover, the experience might bring home to the American people that when Washington advised against "entangling alliances" he did not intend to include alliances which are essential to the integrity of the nation, such as his alliance with France.

What is pan-Americanism but an alliance, and a most one-sided one at that? It is a beautiful sentiment, of course, but other countries do not tolerate sentiment in the Foreign Office. If South America is to be protected against invasion, it must be by naval power and not by a fantastic 6,000-mile railway running through Mexico, Central America, the Brazilian jungles, and the impassable Andes. It would seem that this protection could best be furnished by a coalition of the naval forces of the pan-Angles (to borrow an expression from Mr. Kennedy's book of that title). This coalition could absolutely dominate the Seven Seas and would render a big standing army entirely needless. It would be a sad day for Japanese statesmen, because their vast armies might just as well be disbanded for all they could ever hope to accomplish. Washington intended that this country should be isolated, but we can only accomplish this by surrounding ourselves with invincible navies. It seems unthinkable that he would ever let the ship of state drift to such an extent that he must stand up and say, "I do not know who will be our enemy to-morrow." It appears curious that prominent politicians should think this country is disposed to embrace Prussianism when the British people would hardly take it up with Zeppelins flying overhead.

Such an alliance would have this advantage also: that whereas under universal arbitration most nations would not uphold our tariff and alien exclusion laws, parts of the British Empire are just as selfish about these matters as we are. For even those of us who believe in them freely admit that both policies are selfish. Universal arbitration is a beautiful sentiment, but it is not to our interest.

E. H. Taylor.

Pittsburgh, Pa., April 30.

SOCIOLOGY AND HUMANISM.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Certain reflections occur to one almost inevitably on reading together Professor Sherman's paper on "The Humanism of Shakespeare" (*Nation*, April 27) and that of Professor Keller on "Sociology and Science" (*Nation*, May 4). If the distinctively human element in man is, as Professor Sherman says, a force that moves in an opposite direction from temperament and is known practically as a power of control over appetite and impulse, it follows that the difficulty with sociology is far more fundamental than Professor Keller supposes. For sociology either neglects or denies any such power of control in the breast of the individual; it seeks to deal with man naturalistically, to bring him entirely under the "law for thing"; it is only one aspect of our one-sided intoxication with physical science. Even, therefore, if the sociologist succeeds in satisfying the man of science, he cannot satisfy the humanist. The attempt to dispense with wisdom in favor of science is found not merely in the contemporary sociologists of whom Professor Keller disapproves, but in Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer, who apparently have his approval. A particular sociologist may be respectable through his thorough knowledge of some subject that belongs primarily either to the natural or to the human law—hygiene, let us say, or ethics—but in that case he is parasitic. He can put his subject on an independent footing only by seeking to deal naturalistically with facts that come within the domain of the human law, and then he falls into mere emotionalism or pseudo-science or some mixture of the two. A similar fallacy runs through political economy in all its forms from Adam Smith to Karl Marx.

Man, the humanist insists, must control himself, not because of what he owes to society, but because of what he owes to himself. Any other basis of control is chimerical. Mere altruism is unable to cope with what is perhaps the most deep-seated of all impulses—the will to power. The monstrous events that are taking place in Europe are not unrelated to the naturalistic tampering with the human law and its dictates that has been going on for a century and more. Those who offer ineffective substitutes for a genuinely humanistic discipline may turn out to be the real enemies of civilization. Dr. David Snedden, who has recently resigned his position as Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts to become a professor in Columbia University, is reported to have said in a recent address: "The humanities now are economics and sociology." Similar doctrine will be found in Mr. Abraham Flexner's pamphlet, "A Modern School," that has been spread broadcast over the country by the General Education Board. Similar doctrine is also being proclaimed, apparently amid general applause, from a hundred chairs of pedagogy. This attitude towards the humanities so struck a French thinker, M. Emile Hovelaque, during his stay in this country, that he makes it the basis for his somewhat severe judgment of us (see *Revue de Paris*, February 15 and March 1, 1916). American education is being moulded, he says, by a "conception of life and of the ends of man upon this earth which resembles strangely in many respects the German ideal of Kultur." Our drift is towards what M. Hovelaque calls an "inhuman efficiency," tempered, so far as it is tempered at all, by sentimentalism. Persons like Dr. Snedden are wont to dismiss those who do not take kindly to their pseudo-humanities as mere relics of the past. But the humanist is not fighting for the past: he is fighting for a civilized present and a civilized future, and for the past only in so far as it serves this his main purpose.

Irving Babbitt.

Cambridge, Mass., May 21.

THE DEAN OF FOLKLORE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: With the death of Giuseppe Pitré not only Italy, but the literary world in general, loses one of its first and foremost students of folklore. Born in Palermo in 1842, he studied to be a physician, and stuck to his chosen profession to the end. But his real vocation was folklore. To this he dedicated all his spare hours ever since early manhood with indefatigable earnestness, and the results of his steady efforts are a uniform bulk of twenty-five volumes, dedicated chiefly to the study of Sicily, its customs, legends, traditions, amusements, stories, songs, and poetry. Although Pitré's work was handicapped by lack of training and of time, he applied to his chosen field such enamoured perseverance and such genius that his books have stood the test of scholarship and have indeed been taken as models. He combined the scientific accuracy of a trained historian to the vision of a poet, and through it all had the tireless curiosity of a born investigator and the sympathetic humanity of a doctor. Owing to his modesty he never received sufficient official recognition for his work. With a frail body and a retiring nature he preferred to fight his own fight at home, and to leave to the world the unmistakably rich results of his tireless research—results which, given the close kinship of folklore in all countries, are indeed precious to scholarship, to literature, and to a better understanding of human motives.

Rudolph Altrocchi.

The University of Chicago, May 18.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

"THE THUNDERER."

Delane of the "Times." By Sir Edward Cook. New York: Henry Holt & Co. $1.75 net.

This is a worthy first volume of a series entitled "Makers of the Nineteenth Century," edited by Mr. Basil Williams, which is planned to embrace the period from 1830 to the death of Queen Victoria in 1902. Among the names so far vouchsafed us we find those of Abdul Hamid and Porfirio Diaz; and as if to forestall criticism of his choice, Mr. Williams remarks that "some of these men of genius are predominantly bad, some predominantly good, and in all there is a mixture." For the period under consideration the study of a great publicist like Delane, and the influence of his medium, the "Thunderer," upon the frequently upbraided Victorians, was a necessary and convenient prelude. These were the crucial days of political reform, when *Realpolitik* was becoming significant, and of the heyday of Personality in home and foreign affairs in Europe. To use Meredith's phrase, it was certainly "the very furnace-hissing of events," and in "Diana of the Crossways" he found his prototype for Mr. Tonans in John Thadeus Delane.

Sir Edward Cook reminds us that the great newspaper derived its sobriquet of "Thunderer" long before Delane came to power: it was Edward Sterling, Carlyle's "Magus of the *Times*, who thundered through it to the shaking of the spheres," and father of his friend John, who began an editorial with "We thundered forth the other day on the subject." In fact, the newspaper had long wielded authority and influence when Delane succeeded, at the age of twenty-three, the distinguished editor, Thomas Barnes. The latter, according to his friend, Leigh Hunt, "might have made himself a name in wit and literature, had he cared much for anything beyond his glass of wine and his Fielding." Delane was the opposite, engrossed in politics, fond of society, a fine and eager rider after hounds, writing little but wielding an enormous influence and suggestion over the ablest pens of the day. Moreover, his career was predestined. Delane's father was financial manager of the paper, and the owner, Mr. Walter, took an interest in the training of the son. At Oxford, Delane did not distinguish himself except by exhibiting a resourcefulness we have come to regard as peculiarly American. To indulge his passion for riding to hounds, he added to his small allowance by writing for the London papers, and the year following graduation he began his career on the *Times* of thirty-six years of continuous service.

With these advantages, together with his native self-assurance, it is not surprising that Delane assumed his important rôle unembarrassed by his extreme youth. He later confessed to feeling no qualms or uncertainties. "Not a bit," he promptly replied; "what I dislike about you young men of the present day is that you all shrink from responsibility." Delane immediately set about collecting his writers, making good his rapport with the social world, which at that time was *par excellence* the political. The influence of the *Times* in foreign affairs was incalculable. When Delane's leading editorial writer, Reeve, was presented at the Tuilleries in 1843, Louis Philippe openly expressed his gratitude for services rendered, while the British Cabinet was continually harassed by the thought that the *Times* was widely regarded on the Continent as its official mouthpiece, and when disavowals were unconvincing, a tacit coöperation proved the only alternative for Ministers. Delane successfully kept the confidences of men like Lords Aberdeen and Palmerston, and contributed largely to the life of an administration. But he also kept his sturdy independence. Sir Edward Cook's many stories fully illustrate this side of his character. "Publicity," Delane used to say, "is my trade. . . . Details the public wants and details it shall have." Indeed, he frequently intimated to his influential informants that he could not be bound by secret news which must inevitably reach him through his own channels.

Thus some of the *coups* of the paper were epochal. When war was declared on Russia in 1854, owing to an accident to the official courier, the Czar first saw the ultimatum in the *Times*, which had obtained the information from unknown sources, and thus precipitated an undignified quarrel among the British Ministers. Similar *coups* were announcements of the repeal of the Corn Laws, of the treaty for the neutrality of Belgium in 1866, which was sent directly to Delane, through the Prussian Embassy, from Bismarck, and of the secret intention of Germany in 1875 to crush France once more after her amazing recuperation. As a result of the latter revelation, England and Russia both protested to the Emperor, and the paper averted a crisis through the power it wielded abroad and the valuable news service it maintained in the chancelleries of Europe. Blowitz, Delane's Paris correspondent, was the factor in this *coup*, and the incident is treated in his "Memoirs." As Sir Edward Cook is at pains to show, the singular prescience and thoroughness of Delane was the genius behind fact or rumor, and frequently his assurance was wracked in a crisis after he had published his divinations. But the morrow brought certainty. Delane, however, was not always consistent. He refused help to Denmark in 1864; though a Free Trader, he disagreed with Cobden on peace; like most Englishmen of his day, he erred in regard to our Civil War. In the Crimean War Delane personally investigated his correspondent's charges, and the *Times* performed a great service in pitilessly exposing the incompetence that led to so much misery in that campaign: it supported Florence Nightingale, and lived through a brief period of rancor and unpopularity only to see its suggestions adopted and put into execution. It was Delane who invented the war correspondent, and Russell in the Crimea is the protagonist for that craft. Similarly, in his day Delane was the Nestor of Preparedness, and supported the volunteer movement that flowered in Lord Haldane's Territorials.

For the American reader of to-day, a résumé of the crises that swept English politics is not particularly significant, though they receive skilful treatment at the hands of Sir Edward Cook; but in all these crises Delane wielded enormous influence. In the light of modern journalism it is interesting to remember that Delane launched his famous newspaper "scoops" in the form of "leaders" or editorials. Foreign affairs or a homily to the Queen on her social duties appropriately fell into this medium, and it was an admirable form for the divinations that wrought chaos with Cabinets and chancelleries. Voicing, as it did, official England and the ruling classes, it was the editorial that frankly told us that British sympathy was with the South, and the *Times* played a strong part in supporting the Cabinet in its belligerent attitude in the "Trent" controversy. Lincoln called the paper "one of the greatest powers in the world; in fact, I don't know anything which has more power, except perhaps the Mississippi." In the same year, 1861, Bright remarked in a great speech that "in the *Times* . . . there has not been since Mr. Lincoln took office, in March last, one fair and honorable and friendly article on American affairs." In this matter Sir Edward cannot consistently assert over-statement as regards the conduct of Delane: it is one with the fact that in English domestic affairs Delane was never a democrat. His trusted and able correspondent, Russell, warned him of the misunderstanding and ill-feeling his editorials bred in Washington, and his brief intuition that "South Carolina has no more right to secede from the nation called the United States than Lancashire from England," was followed, in 1862, with "Is the name of Lincoln ultimately to be classed in the catalogue of monsters, wholesale assassins, and butchers of their kind?" Sir Edward thinks that Delane's feelings were influenced by the "Trent" affair, the hostility of the Northern press, the cotton crisis, Lincoln's hesitation on the issue of slavery, and sentiment for the weaker side. At any rate, Delane left Russell unhampered; the latter loyally records: "I had no theories to uphold, no prejudices to subserve, no interests to advance, no instructions to fulfil; I was a free agent." Nevertheless, as Sir Edward admits, "Russell was made the scapegoat, and President Lincoln 'looked black as thunder' at him." Thus the editorials and the news columns were more or less at variance, and Emerson's point is apropos of Delane: "The *Times* never disapproves of what itself has said."

Sir Edward Cook has written an admirable first volume for this series on the nine-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teenth century. Here are names and personalities that are bound to reappear in the following volumes, and he has skilfully made each contribute to the subject of his study while revealing the participant's share in "the furnace-hissing of events." Delane was on intimate terms with Palmerston, Clarendon, Houghton, Cobden, Disraeli, and Aberdeen, not to mention the other great names that gravitated about the maelstrom of Victorian politics. Sir Edward has collected many stories and incidents which do not appear in Kinglake or Dasent and which are new to the present generation on this side of the Atlantic.

CURRENT FICTION.

Viviette. By W. J. Locke. New York: John Lane Co.

This is advertised as "a dramatic little story for summer reading." The experienced novel-buyer must have long since grown suspicious of the article offered for a "summer market." Publishers have assured us also that there is no longer a silly season, that the famous incumbent of the hammock or the veranda-chair prefers Bergson to Oppenheim, and the latest research in Egyptology to the latest frou-frou of seasonable romance. Yet "summer reading" is still a phrase to conjure with, apparently. It must be admitted that Mr. Locke has done something this time which is sufficiently simple, not to say silly, for the emptiest hour and the emptiest head. The story he tells meets a first requirement in being quite conventional and commonplace in substance, and a second requirement, or rather a possible desideratum, in providing here or there a fresh turn or twist of the action, a little fillip of mechanical interest, such as in the eyes of the movie-public constitutes "punch." Here are Viviette, the coquette; Dick, the sturdy, plodding, country-bred brother; Austin, the brilliant, successful, city-honored brother; the dowager mother, who favors the brilliant chap. Both of these men are in love with Viviette; Viviette flirting with both, playing with fire, and all that; excursions and alarums; Dick, in a stage-scene with a set of ancient duelling pistols, attempts to do for Austin. Luckily, a flash in the pan. Austin, horrified, loves Dick, and might be willing to leave Viviette to him if he thought she would be safe. But why shouldn't he take a notion to shoot *her* some time? Dick cannot think why, is about to go into exile at Vancouver, when Viviette suddenly, after being betrothed to Austin for a few hours, decides that she loves Dick alone, and will go with him. The punch comes at the moment when Viviette announces, "I'm a primitive woman, and Dick's a primitive man—and, thank God! we understand each other, and love each other as primitive people do!" —and clinches the matter by crying: "I want you to love me strongly and fiercely for ever and ever—and I'll be a great wife to you, and if I ever fail . . . if I ever play fast and loose with your love again—I want you to kill me." We suggest that Dick loses a chance for a bit of really masculine punch by not promising.

The Daughter of the Storage. By William Dean Howells. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Nothing could better illustrate a change in fashion which has taken place during the past quarter-century than comparison of this collection with any group of tales by any popular story-teller of this generation. The papers which make up the book are not stories at all, according to current magazine standards. They would be classified as sketches, and sketches are, the editors say, in very little demand by the current publics. Luckily Mr. Howells and a few others are in a position to stroll on their way, without regard to the speed requirements exacted (by our pockets, at least) of the rest of us. And there must, after all, be a considerable number of old-fashioned readers—gentle readers, as they used to be called—who find a volume of this sort, now and then, vastly refreshing in its bland indifference to the vaunted technique of the hour. It is even possible that a writer like Mr. Howells may not be a belated performer in a primitive field, but master of an art more delicate and finished than these brisk exploiters of the "punch" could conceivably approach. This is a miscellany. Some of the items are confessedly trifles. Two or three which use the dialogue form do not compare over-favorably with those Howells farces which enchanted us in youth. Two or three others which are cast in verse hardly achieve, or seem to attempt, the plane of serious poetry. But they are all characteristic and authentic: nobody else could have done them as they are done. The two longer stories, "The Daughter of the Storage" and "The Critical Bookstore," are as perfect bits of quiet whimsy as even Mr. Howells has produced. The volume, we say again, is one to be genuinely cherished by readers who do not find every need of nature satisfied by the type of short fiction which "O. Henry" and his idolaters have established as the ruling mode.

Strasbourg: An Episode of the Franco-German War. By Paul and Victor Margueritte. Translated by S. G. Tallentyre. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

All that France has learned since 1870 has been eloquently attested by her writers, but it has required the confirmation of a wider-reaching catastrophe to bring the truth of their testimony home to the English-speaking nations. How often in the last year and a half have we found our own most recent impressions anticipated on the pages of a French book five, ten, or perhaps twenty years old. It is this recognition of much that is "particularly applicable to our own times" in the "Strasbourg" of Paul and Victor Margueritte that has impelled the translator and lent her special zeal. No one can read of Strasbourg under bombardment, the heroisms and sufferings of her burghers, the burning of her ancient monuments—the priceless treasures of her library, the venerated beauty of her cathedral—and the suppressed anguish of her enforced submission without fresh parallels in mind. The killing and maiming of women and children by shells, and the refusal of the German commander-in-chief to allow these non-combatants to leave the city, because "the weak point of the fortification of strong places is the suffering of the inhabitants, who are exposed without protection to the bullets of the enemy," even these, alas! are no longer incredible to our generation. The mere fact that it involved such episodes would make it impossible today to read this tale of the domestic calamities involved in military conquest without a swelling of the heart, even had it been told with less skilful and moving simplicity. And yet perhaps it is in some of the quieter passages that the events of 1914 are best forecast:

> Madam Germath had put Charles to bed, and listened with uneasiness to his irregular breathing. As she looked at the dark circles round his eyes and at his sunken cheeks, her French heart vowed a vow that he should never forget—that he should remember all his life long, Noémi crushed beyond recognition, Strasbourg red with flames and resounding with bursting shells; that the privations and tears of these mournful days . . . . should remain engraved upon his soul.

The Light That Lies. By George Barr McCutcheon. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

This is an uncommonly good long short story, or "novelette." Mr. McCutcheon is not always master of a pure English style, but he always knows what he is about. And that is not to bamboozle his public into thinking it is getting "literatoor" or anything else that it doesn't really hanker for. It is to give that public a perfectly clean-cut article of its kind, a tale in which things happen excitingly to an appointed but often unexpected end. The present title very cleverly fits the story, since its meaning shifts with the meaning of the events recorded. The courtroom is now an established setting for playwright and novelist, and the changes have been pretty thoroughly rung upon the fourfold humors of the bench, the witness stand, the counsels' arena, and the jury-box. Mr. McCutcheon may have got an idea for his purpose from Barrie's "Legend of Leonora." Here again the course of justice is blocked by the wiles of a pretty woman. But the situation receives a fresh twist mechanically and morally. In the first place, she triumphs purely with her eyes. They seem to utter a personal appeal of half-confidence, half-promise—to each of the jurymen, to the opposing counsel, to the judge himself—and without the aid of a spoken word they win the case. As the innocent daughter of the aged defendant she wrenches from her victims, against all the evidence, a virtual acquittal. The story is told

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the point of view of one of the jurors, and the special surprise comes with his belated discovery of the real character and profession of the damsel to whom he has lost his heart. Reviewers are reprimanded for revealing such surprises; we may only hint that this one involves a quick shift from romantic comedy to—a totally different order of performance.

THE ART OF THOUGHT.

Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature: A Series of Extracts and Illustrations Arranged and Adapted by Lane Cooper. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.20 net.

It is a grievous fault in educational method when the instructor lays stress upon inculcating what to think instead of training his students how to think. Even in the teaching of science, where fact necessarily comes to the fore, one may doubt whether the student, however advanced, is really trained to think, let us say, chemically or biologically, to treat the most exact science as something in perpetual flux. And in the historical studies, the humanities, this lack of the "how" is only too evident. There is a plenitude of lectures and readings upon the facts of, for example, a poet's life and doings, the value of his writings in comparison with those of his predecessors and successors. But students are seldom if ever introduced into the poet's workshop, so to speak, and stimulated to find out for themselves how he approaches his subject, why he follows one line rather than another, in short, to determine his personal equation.

Professor Cooper's present book is a courageous attempt to teach the young how to confront literature in general, and English poetry in particular, as a problem demanding strenuous thought. The editor is in his college classes nothing if not strenuous. To him the study of literature is not a mere passive acceptance of æsthetic soul-thrills, not even a mere evaluation of relative values, but rather an intellectual wrestling with the poet's spirit, a determination like Jacob's, not to let the spirit depart without a blessing.

How far the present book will succeed in initiating its readers into the literary problem is a question which time alone can decide. In any event, the book will open the eyes even of the dullest to the fact that there is a problem, a very difficult one. They will at least learn that things are not to be taken for granted.

In our judgment, Section V, pp. 96-186, "On the Studies of Poets," will be the most profitable for a beginning. It ought to exorcise forever the crude vulgar notion that the root of originality rests in ignorance; put conversely, the truth will emerge that the most original writer is the man who has read the most. As usual, Goethe puts the case (p. 165) with final incisiveness:

> After all, what can we call our own except energy, strength, and will? If I could give an account of all that I owe to great predecessors and contemporaries, there would be but a small balance in my favor. . . . Even the greatest genius would not go far if he willed to draw everything out of his own internal self. But many very simple-minded men do not comprehend that; and they grope in darkness for half a life, with their dreams of originality.

In general, the book is made up of extracts from well-known thinkers, ranging from Plato to Théophile Gautier and Kenyon Cox. Professor Cooper is an editor of extracts, not the composer of a formal treatise. Only in one place does he introduce himself at length (pp. 96-132), in "A Glance at Wordsworth's Reading," reprinted from Modern Language Notes. He is the stanchest of Wordsworthians; Section III, pp. 57-62, offers "Extracts from Letters of Wordsworth on the Study and Practice of Poetry." Some readers might protest: Too much Wordsworth; and in a sense the protest would be justified. Yet we should bear in mind that Wordsworth, with all his limitations, is a trustworthy guide, philosopher, and friend.

The statement of Art and Method (pp. 2-4) seems to us unwise, even though it may rest on the authority of Aristotle. Art and method are not interchangeable terms. Even the ancients discriminated between the useful arts and the liberal; the former were for slaves, the latter for freemen. The useful arts are nothing but method; for example, the art of watch-making is nothing but the approved and regular method of producing watches that keep correct time. But in the liberal arts method is only an underlying condition, quite distinct from the genuinely artistic impulse and touch. Granted that a poet must observe something like a method, a set of general principles, nevertheless he will be its master, not its obsequious follower. In Shakespeare's phrasing: "Nice customs courtesy to great kings." In the study of literature we are to beware of formalism.

Further, we judge Herbert Spencer's opinion of the relation of art to science (pp. 8-13) to be strained, distorted. "Science itself is poetic"; scarcely. "Science excites poetry rather than extinguishes it"; a half-truth which may be more dangerous than unqualified error. Nor is Spencer's doctrine helped by his reference to Goethe: "He who contemplates the life of Goethe must see that the poet and the man of science can coexist in equal activity." Goethe was indeed both poet and man of science, but he had the knack of keeping his poetry and his science carefully apart; above all, he never fell into the blunder of poetizing science. As for his poetry, we can describe it only in the words of Klopstock on the German language:

> Gesondert, ungemischt, und nur sich selber gleich.

There are other points at which we might take issue with Professor Cooper, or rather with the authors whom he presents. But space fails us; besides, criticism of criticism is a thankless job; it merely irritates. We content ourselves with the remark that Section VI, "Method in the Poetry of Love," is very abstruse; so abstruse, indeed, that the ordinary student can hardly be expected to master it. Still, the veriest dullard ought to learn from it that Love in its noblest sense is something quite different from that which passes current under the name. The section deals with what we would call the highly artificial poetry of deep meditation rather than with passionate utterance. Thus, the poetry of the troubadours, so conventional, will be intelligible only to one who has studied Provençal; the assonance of even so simple a piece as George Eliot's "Spanish Gypsy" fails of appeal to the English ear. Palmer's study of George Herbert is a fresh instance of the danger attendant upon intense specialization; his dictum (p. 210): "Until Herbert appeared, unity of structure was little regarded," will not pass unchallenged. Herbert's two poems, "Hope" and "Love Unknown," though indubitably powerful, are the utterances of a mystic. To estimate how far they are short of all-compelling poetry, we need only contrast them with "Lycidas." The conclusion of the section, however, Saint Paul's outburst on love, is something to which all will cry Amen.

YANKEE WHALERS.

The Real Story of the Whaler: Whaling, Past and Present. By A. Hyatt Verrill. New York: D. Appleton & Co. $2 net.

A difficulty with such books as this is that they are too uncompromisingly one thing or another. They are mere repositories of more or less curious fact, or they are thinly disguised rhapsodies, got up by the copy-maker as a sort of enlarged "Sunday story." The present book is not written in a glowing or pictorial style. Its first object is to assemble all available facts of significance to the theme. On the other hand, it is keenly alive to the romantic or historic interest of those facts. The result is a volume in which you may learn, in brief compass, much about the history of American whaling, the technique of the trade or the craft, and notable exploits or adventures connected therewith. Fiction, says Mr. Verrill, has commonly cast a false glamour of romance about the whaleman's calling: "But no fiction has ever been written which does justice to the indomitable courage, the reckless daring, the terrific dangers, the unspeakable hardships, the heart-breaking labor, the terrible privations, the inhuman brutality, and the sublime heroism which were all in the day's work of the whalemen." The prosperity of New England during two centuries was largely built upon the whaling industry. Yankee whalemen ranged from the Arctic to the Antarctic, mapped the Gulf Stream, sought the Northwest Passage, made the American flag known among the Eskimos, in Polynesia, in Japan. And from every point of the compass they brought back wealth to New England, to those little coast towns which had so wide a fame: "In many a dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tant land and to many a strange people the name of New Bedford, New London, Gay Head, Nantucket, Bristol, or Sag Harbor was more familiar than New York, Washington, or Boston."

The beginnings of Yankee whaling were accidental and local. The Biscay whale, a small right whale, abounded off the shores of Cape Cod and Long Island, and was a chief inducement to settlers. By 1639 the whaling industry had become one of the most important sources of revenue in Massachusetts, but it was fifty years later that the first whaling cruise was undertaken. Till then whales were taken from small boats entirely. In 1644 Southampton "was divided into four wards of eleven people each whose duty was to secure and cut up the whales that came ashore." By 1700 a considerable fleet hailed from New England, chiefly from Nantucket and New Bedford. Since ships were outfitted for three years or more, great stores must be carried, and the prosperity of the whaling towns arose largely from the resulting industries. The most striking item of historic fact Mr. Verrill records has to do with the make-up of the typical whaling crew. It is as dingy a chapter of New England history as that of the slave-trade which at times rivalled whaling as a source of profit. Indeed, successful whaling itself appears to have involved a sort of peonage. The first months of a whaling cruise were given to breaking in a totally and desirably green crew. The skippers and under officers were fine seamen, the crews never. Conditions of labor and pay aboard a whaler did not tempt real sailors, nor did the owners want them. One captain confessed that they "wouldn't ship a real sailor if he paid his passage." For a real sailor would not have endured the handling then customary on a long whaling voyage, and a single seaman aboard might stir up mutiny or wholesale desertion at the first port touched. Therefore, the class sought by the owners' agents was of the lowest sort: "derelicts of humanity from the gutters, raw-boned lads from the interior farms, ne'er-do-wells of respectable families, factory hands, clerks, vagabonds, gamblers, tramps, criminals striving to evade the law, loafers from park benches." Such as these might be cajoled by false promises, fleeced by outfitters, drugged, shanghaied; and after the ship had sailed, worked under conditions of helpless slavery. And from these materials, for a surplus of profit, skippers chose the pain of creating a hardy and efficient machine for accomplishing their deeds of "heroism"—one of the paradoxes which trouble the reverent investigator of Yankee manners and morals. The present author seems to be little distressed by the apparent dilemma. Somehow he is able to look upon the emprise of whaling as among the noblest, at the same moment acknowledging that the business of whaling was among the most infamous.

The chapter on True Stories of Whaling contains a series of anecdotes of extraordinary occurrences which a romancer would find it difficult to outdo. Indeed, several of them belong to a department of truth with which fiction dares not vie. Among them are tales of ships being rammed and sunk by furious whales, of the monster who bit a whaleboat in two, seized one of the crew in his jaws, sounded, and presently "breached from the water close at hand, and, to the wonder of the men, threw the mate into the forepart of the broken boat." And the lucky Jenkins was only "much bruised" and none the worse for his adventure, after a fortnight. What ruined the business of Jenkins and his tribe was, it appears, not lack of whales—record catches are still brought into New Bedford—but a rapid dwindling in the importance and the price of whale-oil, upon the entrance into the market of better illuminants and cheaper lubricants. The whalemen now are chiefly Portuguese—thriftiest and most industrious of all our immigrants who cling to the open-air trades, the fortunes of the land and of the sea.

Notes

"The Gate of Asia," by William Warfield, will be published shortly by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

E. P. Dutton & Co. announce the forthcoming publication of "The Rambles of a Canadian Naturalist," by S. T. Wood.

"Making Type Work" is the title of a volume by Benjamin Sherbow shortly to be published by the Century Company.

Harper & Brothers announce the publication to-day of "The Plunderers," by Edwin Lefevre, and "A-B-C of Home Saving," by Lissie C. Farmer.

The following volumes are among the announcements for June of Longmans, Green & Co.: "Lectures on Serbia," by Nicolai Velimirovic; "Some Experiences in Hungary," by H. J. C. Macdonald; "A French Mother in War Time," the journal of Madame Edouard Drumont, translated by Grace C. Bevir; "Priests in the Firing Line," by René Gaël; "A Year Ago" ("Eye-witness's Narrative of the War," from March to July, 1915); "Municipal Life and Government in Germany," by William Harbutt Dawson; "Coram Cardinali," by Edward Bellasis; "Liberty and Loyalty," by Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall; "Nature, Miracle, and Sin," by T. A. Lacey; "Splinters of the Cross," by Ruth Eva Priestley; "When God Came," by M. A. Bousfield; "The Celtic Christianity of Cornwall," by Thomas Taylor; "The Story of an Old Meeting-House," by J. M. Connell. Of the publications of Manchester University, the same firm announces: "Thomas Hardy," by H. C. Duffin; "British Birds" (Vol. III), by Archibald Thorburn; "The Folk Element in Hindu Culture," by Benoy Kumar Sarkar; "The Foundations of Indian Economics," by Radhakamal Mukerjee; "An Ancient Family," by Arthur Robert Ingpen; "Authentic Dreams of Peter Blobbs," told by himself; "The Migration of Fish," by Alexander Meek; "Farm Buildings and Building Construction in South Africa," by W. S. H. Cleghorne; "Milk and Its Hygienic Relations," by Janet E. Lane-Claypon; "The Spirit of Christianity," by Frederic Seebohm; "The Russians and Their Language," by Madame N. Jarintzov.

The war has manifestly had its effect, if not on the thought, at least on the manner, of Elizabeth Bisland (Mrs. Wetmore). In "The Case of John Smith: His Heaven and His Hell" (Putnam; $1.25 net), she lays aside the tendency to epigram which marked her book, "At the Sign of the Hobby Horse," and becomes simple to a degree. Perhaps she realized that perfect simplicity was necessary for any understanding whatever of the ambitious work which she had in mind. Even as it stands, this book presents difficulties to one who would classify it. Is it an attempt at another "Divine Comedy," or is its protagonist a Socrates revived? It is, in any case, a philosophical and theological romance which aims to set this old world right. The machinery is not complicated. We have, briefly, an account of the spiritual experience of John Smith, commuter; his wife, and their small circle of friends. Having fallen into the usual rut of discontent, John Smith meets a Shining Lady while on his way home from the railway station. By her he and at length the others are instructed in the secrets of the universe. This is contrived by a series of remarkable journeys, during which they go backward and forward in time and space, under the sea and above the earth. The stage is set for their special delectation, and they see the processes of life at work from its beginning. The upshot of the whole performance is the conviction that, with a little imagination, one can discover in this world enough blessings to make one supremely happy. Described thus baldly, the work would seem to be little more than a "Sunday-school story," but Mrs. Wetmore does, in fact, review all the large questions of the day, including theology and Socialism. To label her philosophy is difficult, because her presentation is so informal. While not agreeing with Leibnitz that this is the "best possible world," she insists that every one has the best possible reason to be happy. In the personally conducted tours is an objecting Scot, who, however, is easily confuted by the Shining Lady. We are bound to confess that, if he had been drawn truer to life, he might on several occasions have made of her a shining mark, for she not infrequently rides roughshod over well-established theories. Even so, Mrs. Wetmore's book will doubtless set many to thinking, and will help some to derive contentment from hard conditions.

There is some uncommonly lively reading in "A Merry Banker in the Far East and South America" (Lane; $1.50 net). The jovial one is Walter H. Young, and the candid description of himself in the title is thoroughly well justified by the reminiscences with which he has beguiled the hours of retirement in hearty middle life. We may add that it is also borne out by the author's portrait, which serves as the frontispiece of the volume. Of the business of banking, in which Mr. Young was singularly successful, we hear relatively little, but concerning his social adventures he is frankness itself, writing with an engaging candor and in the conversational style which one clubman might employ to another over the whiskey and soda that plays a not unimportant part in the bill of fare. The following,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from a late chapter, may be taken as a sample of the author's method:

By this time the reader will have formed a pretty good idea of me and all my works, for he has known me since I was nineteen, when I was as fit as a flea and as thin as a whippet. Alas! I am now neither the one nor the other; for to-day I might pass for a rubicund, well-nourished old colonel, with a bow-window and half-pay; but I shall never, never pass again for nineteen. . . . Every dog has his day, and every lady dog has hers, too, I presume; so one must take things as they are, and try to grow old gracefully and not disgracefully, for what is pardonable in youth when the blood is hot is unpardonable when your head is as bald as a billiard ball or frosted with age.

It was highly fitting that Harvard's celebration of the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death should be signalized by a formal address by Professor Kittredge. The address, which has now been published by the Harvard University Press, though it throws no new light on the great dramatist, serves as a reminder of the shrewd sense which has always been the essence of Professor Kittredge's criticism. Professor Kittredge himself gracefully disclaims any pretence of originality by referring to Dr. Johnson's adage that men need, in general, not so much to be informed as to be reminded. Perhaps, however, the author goes too far in implying that nothing fresh about Shakespeare can now be said with profit. One would think that, with the prodigious machinery which Shakespearean scholarship has at its command, this were just the time for something like a final word to be spoken. Admitting with Professor Kittredge that, owing to Shakespeare's many-sidedness, there are to-day as many Shakespeares as there are people who read him, still the fact remains that in the case of other great creative writers criticism has been able to arrive at an approximation of their philosophies of life. Professor Kittredge, however, contents himself for the most part with examining flaws in other person's comments, contriving in this way to set forth briefly his own conceptions of a few leading characters. We may note one example of his reasoning which is not quite so convincing as he usually is. Glancing at critics who censure Hamlet for alleged inaction, he says, rightly, that Laertes is Hamlet's foil, and insists that, if Hamlet is wrong, Laertes must be right; whereas few have risen to praise the latter for his "rash singleness of purpose." It is, of course, conceivable that Hamlet's inaction might have been less, and at the same time have preserved the contrast with the conduct of Laertes. We could wish that Professor Kittredge were impelled to address public audiences more frequently than he appears to be.

In the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for May Mr. L. Wolman presents the results of an elaborate investigation on the extent of labor organization in the United States. The investigation seems to have been undertaken under the auspices of the defunct and little lamented Industrial Commission, which began with an ambitious programme of elaborate inquiry into any and every phase of social questions, and came to the inglorious end with which the world is sufficiently familiar. This particular inquiry happened to be put into most competent hands, and the results as now published are interesting and surprising. Mr. Wolman procured authenticated figures from trade-union sources concerning the numbers enrolled in the various unions. These numbers were compared with the census figures of 1910, showing the total persons employed in the respective industries. The comparison was by no means an easy one, since the classification of occupations in the census is not at all in accord with the lines of trade-union demarcation. But by dint of laborious compilation the task was carried out. It appears that out of some 38,130,000 persons employed in the United States, only a trifle over 2,000,000 (exactly 2,116,317) were members of trade unions, or hardly more than 5 per cent. Taking male employees alone, the percentage of trade unionists was a trifle larger, 6.8 per cent. By trades the results are even more surprising. In a group of industries employing just about one-half of the total, less than 1 per cent. were unionists. This group, it should be said, however, includes agriculture. At the other extreme, the very highest percentage of unionism appears in the liquor and beverage industries, in which over 40 per cent. of the employees were unionists. The large percentage in this case is ascribable to the influence of the labor patronage of beer and the pressure which a boycott can bring to bear on breweries. It is surprising that transportation and the building trades, in which unionism bulks so large in the public eye, fall into the group having a percentage of organization no greater than 15 or 20 per cent. Within the transportation group, however, one finds certain occupations in which the percentage of organization is at the maximum. Of the 65,000 railway conductors, 87 per cent. are in the union; and of 96,000 locomotive engineers, 74 per cent. are in the union. For the student of labor questions, the paper will be for many years the basis of discussion and of further investigation; and the author closes with an effective plea for the better gathering and arrangement of the pertinent statistical material. On this subject, as on so many others, what is needed is not the accumulation of more figures so much as the better handling of the raw material which is already available. So far as the public at large is concerned, the outstanding result of the inquiry is the extraordinarily small minority of the total working population which is enrolled in labor organizations.

"We," by Gerald Stanley Lee (Doubleday, Page; $1.50 net), is a protracted plea for peace and good-will which offers just one novel and promising idea, namely, that institutions of all sorts, and especially nations, should take pains to express their best spirit through skilful advertising. Dumbness and taking things for granted, and consequent misunderstanding, are the trouble at all points. Expert advertising of the best self of man, corporation, or nation is the remedy. There is evident merit in the idea, and recent developments in advertising show that there is nothing fantastic in the programme. It will be hard, however, for any hard-headed person to do full justice to a programme presented in Mr. Lee's literary style. He gushes, and slushes, and shrinks into epigram in a fashion which alternately recalls Elbert Hubbard, Walt Whitman, G. K. Chesterton, and Emerson. Such a literary crazy-quilt may be alluring to certain readers. On us, however, it leaves precisely the ambiguous impression that the minor New England transcendentalists of Emerson's time produce. There is a perplexing blend of the seer, the windy idealist, the mere talker, and the sheer charlatan. Mr. Lee's general dogma that people are good, and sin only from ignorance and misunderstanding, is as old as Socrates. He pounds in the notion that our moral and physical safety lies in rightly expressing ourselves and understanding others. So trite a conclusion will hardly be challenged. What excites doubt is the confidence that by a sudden and sublime art of advertising—or "attention-engineering," as Mr. Lee chooses to call it—everything might, once for all, be made right. Mr. Lee's belief in collective miracles is his forte and his foible. It is his particular half-truth, and it leads him to represent the general complacency and inertia of America, our mere laziness, as a regenerative principle for a stricken world. This is again of a piece with the old transcendentalism of New England. It believed so much in its talk that it failed to grasp any corresponding human reality or to need it. Mr. Lee places between himself and the American people a curtain of rhetoric which sheds upon them, and doubtless upon himself, a gorgeous iridescence. Perhaps it is a rainbow of hope; more likely it is just a verbal shimmer, interesting chiefly because it recalls the far-off patter of Bronson Alcott and his fellow-visionaries.

Sir Oliver Elton's statement, in his "Survey of English Literature," that there was room for a pleasing and varied anthology from the prose works of Robert Southey, was a very mild expostulation against the neglect of a writer entitled to high praise. In prose as in poetry, Southey has been largely stifled by the quantity of his output. His total production in both fields would fill hardly less than 200 volumes; and while "The Holly Tree" and "The Well of St. Keyne" and portions of "Thalaba" have been easy to detach from his poetical works, the patience required to wade through the 195 volumes of prose and select what is permanently valuable has hitherto been wanting to any scholar. The "Life of Nelson" is perennially popular, and reprints have also been made in the last half-century of portions of the "Naval History of England" and of "The Doctor," but no more. Yet his prose has not merely the qualities for which it is conventionally commended, lucidity and elegance, which De Quincey justly remarked conferred no particular distinction; but it is often powerful, vigorous, and melodious. Dr. Jacob Zeitlin has done the study of English literature a considerable service in rescuing from the histories and biographies, the critical papers, "The Doctor," the "Letters of Espriella," and the commonplace books, some four hundred pages of prose notable for both content and form ("Select Prose of Robert Southey"; Macmillan; $1.50 net). In the compass of this book Southey appears not as the portentously dull writer we imagine him, but as a charming and finished, if sometimes rather forced, essayist. Dr. Zeitlin has kept his eye principally upon readableness, and the selections do not pretend to a representative character. Random and whimsical passages of meditation predominate, but there are also two stirring battle scenes, an economic essay, and some pure description. A biographical and critical introduction emphasizes the external history of Southey's prose writings, which has been rather glossed over in Dowden's short life and other accounts of the author, and also sets forth Southey's political and economic views and his connection with various periodicals. It is perhaps to be regretted that no space was found for a few of Southey's letters.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

James Norman Hall, in "Kitchener's Mob," (Houghton Mifflin; $1.25 net), takes us over some of the same ground that was covered by Ian Hay's "The First Hundred Thousand." The title, "Kitchener's Mob," which was applied to the early thousands of the new armies and has stuck to them now that they are counted by millions, is by no means a sobriquet of contempt; it is the name the men chose for themselves, and the fact that they did so is perhaps as good an answer as could be found to the fear that England herself may be subdued to the militaristic spirit which she is fighting. One cannot imagine a body of Prussian troops alluding irreverently to itself as "Hindenburg's Mob." The author is a young American who happened to be in England when war broke out and over whom, in his own words, "the mob spirit gained its mastery" in August, 1914. Ian Hay's book tells the experiences in training and at the front of one of the new battalions of a Scotch regiment; Mr. Hall's story is of the Fusiliers, Cockneys most of them, but with a sprinkling of men from all parts of the kingdom. The nine months of training —a weary ordeal—is described vividly and picturesquely in the first few chapters. The rest of the book has to do with the battalion's experiences at the front, culminating in the bloody part which it bore in the Battle of Loos. As an American of good breeding and education sharing as a private the fortunes of his British companions in arms, Mr. Hall writes from an interesting point of view. His comrades were principally of the "lower *middle* class," innocent of much culture or education. Says Mr. Hall, summarizing at the end Thomas Atkins as he found him: "In England, before I knew him for the man he is, I said, 'How am I to endure living with him?' And now I am thinking, how am I to endure living without him; without the inspiration of his splendid courage; without the visible example of his unselfish devotion to his fellows?" The book is full of high tributes to the qualities, moral and physical, of the men of these new armies. We quote but one example:

> In France, his [Tommy's] conduct, in so far as my observation goes, has been splendid throughout. During six months in the trenches I saw but two instances of drunkenness. Although I witnessed nearly everything that took place in my own battalion, and heard the general gossip of many others, never did I see or hear of a woman treated otherwise than courteously. Neither did I see or hear of any instances of looting or petty pilfering from the civilian inhabitants.

Naturally, Mr. Hall's narrative covers much ground that is now more or less familiar, but his style is lively and vigorous and his observation keen. Some things in the book are particularly well done, notably the very interesting and detailed description of the trench-system. It is worth remarking, too, that Mr. Hall has little but praise for the organization that created the new armies. He recalls the muddles and delays that occurred at the beginning, but "at the last, we could only marvel that a great and complicated military machine had been so admirably and quickly perfected." And it is evident that, *pace* Lord Northcliffe, the hero of this organization has been and remains, to the British army, Lord Kitchener.

Dr. Robert M. Smith has brought under cultivation a neglected field in his dissertation, "Froissart and the English Chronicle Play" (Columbia University Press; $1.50 net). The brilliant history of the Flemish chronicler in the able translation of Lord Berners (1523-5) continued to be read during the sixteenth century. Its influence upon the English chronicles is not striking, except in the case of that known as Grafton's Chronicle (1568), but the dramatists used it freely, sometimes as embodied in Grafton, usually in Berners's translation, never in the original French. Apart from its influence on Elizabethan versions of the story of Richard II, the plays of "Jack Straw" and "Woodstock," and Daniel's "Civil Wars," from which Shakespeare got suggestions for his "Richard II," its most interesting appearance is as the source of the first three acts of the anonymous "Edward III." Here, in the episode of the Countess of Salisbury, the hand of Shakespeare has by some been detected, and ingenious theories have been erected on the assumption that these scenes are an interpolation. It is hard to believe in any theory of multiple authorship, however, after Dr. Smith's demonstration that the whole structure of the first three acts, both before and after as well as during the episode in question, follows closely Berners's narrative. This *does not preclude the possibility* of Shakespeare or another having touched up the play (a point that is not raised), but it does destroy any theory based on the addition to an old play of scenes that were not originally there. The proof is rather carelessly read; on p. 41, 1835 should be corrected to 1385, and on p. 85, Edward II stands instead of Edward III.

There seems to be no indication that the number of theological publications setting forth rational and spiritual interpretations of current Christian beliefs is in danger of falling off. One of the most noteworthy of such publications is the Rev. H. S. Coffin's volume entitled "Some Christian Convictions" (Yale University Press; $1), described by the author as a practical restatement in terms of present-day thinking. Religion, says Dr. Coffin, is experience, not dogma; the Bible is authoritative for us in so far as it appeals to our religious needs and aspirations; God is immanent in the world, every truly devout man reflects the divine, but Jesus more than any other man, so that he becomes man's guide to communion with God; the church of Christ is composed of those who are so vitally joined to Jesus Christ that they share his life with God and men. Similar conceptions of the significance of Jesus for human life appear in "The Master Light" (Boston: Pilgrim Press; $1) by W. Elsworth Lawson, and in "Christ's Experience of God" (Pilgrim Press; $1.25), by Frank H. Decker. The value of prayer is set forth by Dr. Galusha Anderson in "Science and Prayer and Other Papers" (Pilgrim Press; $1). To the common objection to prayer based on the belief in the reign of law he replies that God has at his command all the laws of the universe and can use them to effect his purposes. The spiritual power resident in Jesus is made evident, he says, in the fact of atonement through sympathy—an interesting point. On the other hand, he insists on the reasonableness of eternal punishment; that is, the permanence of the psychological experience induced by sin. The religious effectiveness of prayer *without words* is expounded by Cyril Hepher in "The Fruits of Silence" (Macmillan; $1.50 net): thus, says the author, we are led to a deeper consciousness of God. A voice purporting to be in part a revelation from spirits of deceased men is given in "Man's Life of Purpose" (Boston: Richard G. Badger; $1.25), by William C. Comstock, Amanuensis. The view of life here set forth is excellent, not differing in spirit from the utterances of ordinary human ethical thinkers.

The principal subjects treated in the *Annales de Géographie* for March are the beef conditions of the world, the evolution of the population of Alsace-Lorraine, and the colonization of Siberia and its value to the country. During the fourteen years previous to 1910 the population of the western and central parts has increased two and a quarter millions. There is also a summary of the most recent work of Lieut. John C. Soley, U. S. N., on the currents of the Gulf Stream in the Gulf of Mexico.

"The Land of the Best, a Tribute to the Scenic Grandeur and Unsurpassed Natural Resources of Our Own Country," is an apt and well-chosen title to the article to which the *National Geographic Magazine* for April is devoted. It is an earnest plea, and well expressed, by the editor, Gilbert H. Grosvenor, to the American traveller to become acquainted with the attractions of his own country before visiting foreign lands. Before the war 100 American tourists crossed the Atlantic to one who crossed the United States. Starting from the Eastern Coast, he describes briefly but suggestively the principal places of interest in our country. No one who reads his animated descriptions and looks at the beautiful illustrations will fail to agree with him when he says that we "could spend an entire lifetime seeing nature's masterpieces" in our native land, and yet leave many unseen.

Science

PROBLEMS OF RADIATION.

The Electron Theory of Matter. By O. W. Richardson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $4.50.

Productive scholarship in America suffered a serious loss when Professor Richardson left Princeton University to return to England. During his stay here he published a long series of memoirs on electricity, and he also helped to make Princeton an important centre for research work. As a final evidence of his work in this country, he is now publishing a treatise on the applications of the electron theory to various problems of radiation.

The first seven chapters discuss the general theory of electricity and magnetism. This treatment is typically that of the Cavendish school. Maxwell's and Faraday's ideas are given in practically their original form, and there is no doubt that the significance of the equations of the electro-magnetic field is much more easily seen when expressed in the Cartesian geometry than in the new vector analysis. Reading this in connection with Professor Jeans's treatise on Electricity and Magnetism, the student should be fully prepared to add on the necessary modifications required by the electron theory. The remainder of the book is given to prob-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lems connected with the recent discoveries in electricity and radiation. In this part vector analysis is used with great skill.

While Professor Richardson is an advocate of the electrodynamic theory of mechanics, he does not lose sight of the hypothetical nature of the theory. And, indeed, as he develops his ideas, it is apparent that it remains in his mind as a convenient symbolism rather than as a substantial change in thought. This opinion seems justified from his statement on page 216:

> At present we can only be certain that matter is made up in part of electrons. If this should turn out to be ultimately true, we should have to say that during quasi-stationary dynamical actions the electromagnetic momentum of the field is converted partly into the electromagnetic momentum of the individual electrons and partly into material momentum, the total momentum being unaltered.

His conservative attitude towards the nature of electrical forces is shown by his conclusions, given on page 14, concerning the rival claims of the action at a distance and medium theories:

> The great advantage of the medium view is that it pictures the operation of a mechanism whose consequences insist on foretelling themselves, whereas the other is mere dead description. For this reason the medium view has been most successful in leading the great advances in electrical science, while the strength of the action at a distance formulation lies in its mathematical simplicity. There is no absolute contradiction between the two views. . . . Which is the more desirable is largely a matter of taste or convenience.

The treatise, as a whole, shows a profound knowledge of the subject, which is generally conceded to be the most erudite and thorny problem in science. At the same time, with the inherent tendency of the English physicists not to push abstract logic too far, the fault is avoided of losing sight of the fact that physics must in the last analysis rest on concrete phenomena. Undoubtedly the same tendency is true of physicists in this country, yet, owing to our unhappy divorce of mathematics and physics, we must admit the lamentable fact that a treatise of this type is not to be expected of us. And the worst of it is, there are no signs that the students in our graduate schools are being encouraged to acquire a mathematical knowledge of that intimate nature which English physicists possess when they begin their independent work.

The continuing popularity of the "insect books" of J. Henri Fabre is attested by a fifth volume of extracts from the "Souvenir Entomologiques" in the entirely adequate translation of A. T. De Mattos—"The Hunting Wasps" (Dodd, Mead; $1.50 net). Though perhaps not quite so engrossing as one or two of the earlier collections of Fabre's essays, the present volume naturally illustrates abundantly the curiosity, the sympathy, the poetic charm, with which this keen-eyed naturalist colored his accounts of insect habit. Chapter III, entitled A Scientific Slaughterer, is a capital instance of his skill in presentation. It tells of the solution which the Cerceris found when confronted by the problem of storing food, for the larva, that would remain immobile without being dead. Fabre proceeds by asking, at each step in the search for the solution, what a group of the most learned scientists, "an academy of anatomists and physiologists," would do. The goal is paralysis. The Cerceris is found, first, to choose the one vulnerable spot at which to insert her sting in the insect, and secondly, to restrict her intended prey to those beetles "with motor centres brought close together or even gathered into a common mass," these beetles being the weevils and buprestes. "A certain inward resemblance, that is to say, the centralization of the nervous system, must therefore be the reason why the lairs of the different Cerceres are crammed with victims bearing no outward resemblance whatever." Fabre tests the method by experiment, using the point of a fine steel nib charged with a minute drop of ammonia, and succeeds in inducing immobility in the beetles which the Cerceris prefers, for a month and even two months, but not in the beetles which the Cerceris avoids. The essay manifests much the same kind of skill that made Huxley's "A Piece of Chalk" a notable piece of literary scientific writing.

Drama

"THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR."

Considered as a whole, "The Merry Wives of Windsor" was the best of the Shakespearean representations which Sir Herbert Tree has been giving in the New Amsterdam Theatre. It was equal to any of them in general excellence of pictorial quality and that ingenuity in the invention of realistic stage business for which this manager is famous, and reflected more of the spirit of the text. The play, of course, is far less exacting in its dramatic requirements than "Henry VIII" or "The Merchant of Venice," but in its group of minor personages affords wider scope than either for eccentric characterization. And it was in this respect that the performance was especially noteworthy, although in two or three instances the effect of some clever work was spoiled by indulgence in that extravagant clowning which, prescribed by some of the stupidest theatrical traditions, has come to be regarded by the average actor as the choicest essence of Shakespearean humor. A striking example of this folly was furnished in the Dr. Caius of Henry Herbert, which in its more moderate moments suggested a vigorous, clear-cut, and humorous conception of a vital Gallic type, but in its wildest descended to every possible depth of acrobatic buffoonery. The applause of the gallery, which would convey a sharp warning to the thoughtful artist, seemed only to spur Mr. Herbert to greater physical exertion. It was a pity. A similar extravagance was fatal to the embodiment of Shallow by Mr. Leonard Mudie, which, had it been less absurdly exuberant in its senile manifestations—palsied antics, gibberings, and squeakings—might have been almost as true as it was false to nature. There was a sound notion at the bottom of it all. Misguided zeal outran all discretion. The Sir Hugh Evans of Douglas Ross, though conventional, was more vital because more reasonable.

The true artistry was exhibited in the Bardolph of the veteran G. W. Anson, who lifted one of the smallest parts into prominence by sheer force of impersonation. Having a full grip of the character, he employed just the right measure of exaggeration to give the needed touch of humor to squalid realism. His illuminative byplay was delicious. A more vivid portrayal of sodden, greedy, shameless alcoholism has seldom been seen upon the stage. It was indisputably real and Shakespearean. Another execellent bit, though naturally far less expert, was the Pistol of Claude Beerbohm. This was conceived and wrought along the right lines, was picturesque, well spoken, and effective. At present it is a trifle wooden, but nevertheless a capital achievement for so young a player. The Nym of Edward Forbes was also praiseworthy. It is long since these satellites of Falstaff have been so satisfactorily presented. George Hayes furnished a particularly neat, artistic, and consistent study—a genuine study—of the timorous and foolish Master Slender. It savored, very properly, of burlesque, but never exceeded the bounds of legitimate satire. Though inevitably conventional in form, it excelled in the nicety of its finish. Miss Maud Milton was a competent Mistress Quickly, and Sydney Greenstreet an efficient Host of the Garter. These were the performances which really constituted the main artistic value of the production.

The Falstaff of Sir Herbert Tree was the work of a skilled comedian, intelligent and amusing, but not in the last inspired. It had the humor of incident and action, but not of character. The mimicry was adroit but superficial, the mood lacking in the essential lusciousness and spontaneity. That very clever American actress, Henrietta Crosman, played Mistress Page with unfailing intelligence and animation, but in a key somewhat too shrill and high pitched. For some of the extravagances in which she and Constance Collier—the Mrs. Ford—indulged, Sir Herbert Tree, it is tolerably safe to guess, was responsible. He intimated so much, in a brief curtain speech, when he asked his audience to remember that the wives were "merry." Shakespeare undoubtedly made them so, but he also set a limit to their pranks, and the wisdom of exceeding it is extremely doubtful. It certainly was not demonstrated on the present occasion. Lyn Harding played Ford well until he became involved in the reckless farce of the later scenes, when he was no longer convincing. To sum up, the representation, which was, in many respects, commendable, would have been much better if artistic restraint had been more freely exercised.

J. R. T.

Under the title "Step This Way," a musical comedy success of some years ago, "The Girl Behind the Counter," was revived last week at the Shubert Theatre in a revised version. As in the earlier production, the principal feature in the performance is Lew Fields. Indeed, the piece may best be described as a series of interludes of which the chief are supplied by Lew Fields. His humor is of the familiar type which amuses Broadway without imposing too severe a strain upon its intelligence; a little child could understand that he was being funny. The rest of the performance is in keeping with the efforts of the comedian, consisting of song, dance, and choral numbers acceptably offered.

In translating "Master Olof" (American-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scandinavian Foundation; $1.50), Edwin Björkman will probably raise August Strindberg in the estimation of those English readers who know him only through his misogynistic and pessimistic social dramas. This is the earliest prose version of a work, now regarded as a Swedish classic, which the author rewrote several times before he could find either publisher or producer. Authoritative Swedish critics pronounce it the best of the series. It is said to have been written in three months, when Strindberg was in his twenty-third year (in 1872), facts which sufficiently account for its loose construction and frequent violence. But it bears unmistakable marks of genius. It deals with that critical period in the early days of the reign of Gustavus Vasa in Sweden when the problem of reconstruction was complicated by all kinds of political, financial, and religious trouble. In an enthusiastic preface, Mr. Björkman considerably overrates the intrinsic value of the piece as historical drama, inasmuch as in matters of time and fact the freest rein is given to imagination, but, in spite of its lurid coloring, the picture presented does not, perhaps, as a whole, greatly misrepresent actual conditions. In any case it is vivid and powerful, although in its coincidences, and many of its details, flagrantly melodramatic. Drastic revision would be needed to make it acceptable on the modern stage, although it is full of effective situations. The especial virtue of it consists in the vigor and vitality of much of the characterization and the spirit of zeal in the cause of personal and religious liberty with which it is animated.

Gert, an imaginary figure, is a striking study of that sincere but purblind fanaticism which has betrayed so many of its victims into deeds which are greater blunders than they are crimes. He really is the protagonist of the drama, as it is he who inspires the nominal hero in his course and who occupies by far the most dignified position in the final catastrophe. The character of Olof—in which Strindberg blended fact and fiction as it suited his purpose—is also drawn vividly and with no little psychological insight. The spiritual conflict in him—bred of intellectual revolt against the grossness of clerical superstition, immorality, and greed; filial devotion; patriotic duty; loyalty to his King; love for the woman who has linked her fortune with his, and cruel perplexity—is depicted powerfully, dramatically, and, in the earlier acts, logically, but his final recantation, after his convictions have made of him a potential regicide, is utterly inconsistent with all that has gone before. It is a bit of sheer and crude theatricalism devised to give effect to Gert's cry of "Renegade," on which the curtain falls. It is not thus that great drama is written. But rare creative ability is exhibited in some of the minor personages. The King and his Chancellor are strong and vital individualities, and Olof's mother is a vigorous and naturalistic study of the havoc wrought by bigotry in conflict with natural instincts. The contrast between her and the younger Christine, daughter of the free-thinking zealot, Gert, is subtle and vivid. In his savage portraiture of the priests the author indulges in the most unwarrantable generalizations, as he does in his anti-feministic plays. Where his own ideas are concerned, he is by no means entirely free from the bigotry which he so furiously execrates. But the play, although no masterpiece, is in many respects a remarkable production, and in translating it, Mr. Björkman has done Strindberg good service.

Art

VAN DYCK'S ETCHINGS.

Van Dyck: His Original Etchings and his Iconography. By Arthur M. Hind. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. $5 net.

The less than two dozen etchings in the series known as the "Iconography," which can undoubtedly be ascribed to Van Dyck himself—in most cases subsequently elaborated by professional engravers—take their place in the front rank of portrait etchings of all time, compelling in their admirable ease and refinement. Our present writer describes them as, in spite of limitations, "incisive, convincingly direct," and "among the most masterly plates produced in the whole history of portrait etching." He notes a "tendency towards idealization," a "temptation to flattery," which he emphasizes by verbal and pictorial comparison of the portrait of Lucas Vorsterman, of "dignified countenance and swagger bearing, with the somewhat wizened features of the same engraver as drawn by Lievens." But perhaps the tendency of Lievens was rather in the opposite direction. At all events, there occurs to us a possible similar comparison of the etched portraits of Ephraim Bonus by Rembrandt and Lievens. There, Rembrandt's attitude, though not that of Van Dyck, also resulted in the softening and ennobling of features and characteristics which Lievens set down with uncompromising insistence.

More particularly has Mr. Hind been concerned with Van Dyck's attitude towards the "Iconography," with the method of production of the plates, and with the justice of certain attributions. To these matters he brings careful research, a patient collation of facts, and no expert's prejudices. Unlike Lionel Cust, Mr. Hind believes that the grisailles—the immediate originals from which the engravers worked—were done by Van Dyck himself, and not by assistants. He brings up and emphasizes the difficulty of solving the question: Were Van Dyck's original etchings for the most part essays undertaken by the way, with a more purely artistic aim and with no immediate intention of incorporation in the "Iconography"? In fact, the author's statement (p. 84) that he has "brought forth no clinching arguments against the authenticity" of certain plates marks the tone of the book, which has an air honestly tentative rather than dictatorially final.

Numerous illustrations give valuable aid in the work of comparison and collation. They are printed on small rectangles of thin paper tipped at the top to the larger pages of the book. Possibly this was supposed to harmonize better with the dignified and well-designed get-up of the book. More likely, however, it was done because the somewhat flimsy inserts were supposed to take the half-tone impression more easily than the better paper of the pages on which they are mounted. An expert in photomechanical processes, such as Mr. S. H. Horgan, would probably advocate printing directly on the white page, hot-pressed. And, of course, one sighs for the possibility of line reproduction instead of half-tone. The plates, however, serve their purpose of illustrating the illuminating text of a welcome addition to Van Dyck literature.

The Director of Fine Arts in the Italian Government, Commendatore Corrado Ricci, makes light of the destruction of art treasures in the burning of the Cathedral Church of Andria. It was not to be compared with other wonderful churches of Apulia. Of ancient foundation (1046), it underwent radical transformations in every century from the fourteenth to our own. The façade was rebuilt as late as the nineteenth century, and the vault of the nave only thirty years ago. The only structure having any tradition of age was the campanile, with its three stories and five biforia. The crypts were cleared out in 1904, with two skulls as the sole archæological result. They are believed to have been those of the second and third wives of the free-thinking and easy-living mediæval Emperor Frederick the Second—Iolanda of Jerusalem and Isabella, sister of Henry the Third of England. Their tombs were conscientiously destroyed centuries ago by Frederick's successors of the French line of Anjou. It seems, however, that some reliquaries of fine mediæval metal work have been lost in the fire.

Lovers of postage stamps should hasten to complete their series of "war stamps." Those of the Red Cross in various countries are the most valuable. France has issued for this purpose original stamps for each of her colonies: Tunis, the cupola of a mosque; Morocco, a caravan in the desert; Guiana, a fantastic animal intended probably for a tapir; and so on for West Africa, Madagascar, and Indo-China. The Russian Red Cross stamps have Tamerlane or St. George and the Dragon. Italy has an eagle with the arms of Savoy worn on its heart.

Finance

BEFORE THE NOMINATIONS.

When a Presidential campaign has progressed as far as late August or September, Wall Street's ability to "pick the winner," as expressd in the betting odds in the financial district, has proved itself practically infallible. Only on one occasion—when the odds, late in the campaign of 1888, suddenly shifted from 10 to 8 on Cleveland to 10 to 8 on Harrison—was even an early autumn "Wall Street betting forecast" misleading. In 1888, moreover, the turn in the odds came only with the belated raising of Quay's enormous campaign fund from the Pennsylvania manufacturers; so that even then the odds told the political facts before and after they had switched.

But this cannot be said of "pre-convention wagers." Wall Street has not forgotten that in the third week of May, 1912, wagers of 2 to 1 against the nomination of either Taft or Roosevelt were reported. On June 5 of that year there were no odds either way on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt's nomination, and in some quarters the "curb brokers" were still offering 2 to 1 against Taft. Whether the "odds" of the past week in Wall Street are as untrustworthy a guide, the event will show. Wall Street itself displayed only mild interest in the reported wagers of 6 to 5 or 5 to 4 against Mr. Roosevelt's nomination, or in the rumored odds on the same candidate in the West, or on the "even money" said to have been offered on the nomination of Justice Hughes.

That the stock market itself should give no evidence of its opinion is even less surprising. It has other things to occupy its mind, and perhaps has not really made up its mind at all as to what it hopes for. At all events, the indifferent behavior of the country's leading financial market fails to square with the popular conception of "Presidential years," when—according to that conception—the stock market should long since have fallen into a state of nervous excitement, reflected in erratic and violent movements.

But the course of the stock market during the Presidential campaigns of the last twenty years makes it a little difficult to understand how this popular tradition has managed to survive so long. Even in 1896, when the issue of the campaign was the "silver" question, with its intimate bearing on financial confidence and international economic relations, it was late in May before the stock market began to cast an anxious eye towards politics. Poor railway earnings and one or two railway receiverships in March and April—a heritage from the panic of 1893—were sufficient, in the minds of Wall Street, to account for the weakness and irregularity of the market.

Politics first became a dominating influence on the Stock Exchange when the silver party unexpectedly captured several State conventions, and the market was almost in a panic just before the convening of the Republican Convention on the 16th of June. Even as late as that, there was a sharp recovery when it became apparent that this National Convention would recognize the gold standard, in spite of the twenty-one "silver delegates" who walked out of the Convention Hall and organized a bolting party. The next month, however, there was a renewed and heavy decline on the adoption of the "silver platform" by the Democratic Convention and the nomination of Bryan in the excitement following his florid declamation against the existing order. The break in prices had almost reached the proportions of a panic by July 20.

But that was an exceptional event. In none of the succeeding Presidential years was politics a really dominant factor in the stock market. Prices broke sharply in May, 1912, for instance, on the day after the New Jersey primaries, when it was learned that Mr. Roosevelt had captured that State's twenty-eight delegates to the Convention. But they recovered when Mr. Roosevelt failed to obtain the nomination in June, and continued to show improvement in July and August, and, in fact, the business situation as a whole continued in a mood of such cheerfulness, up to the very announcement of the result of the electiton, as to put quite out of the reckoning the old tradition of the "disturbing Presidential year."

But what, then, after all, dictates Wall Street's spirit of calmness or uneasiness over a Presidential candidacy? The state of trade and of the markets has something to do with it. The applause of Wall Street for Grant in 1872 and its rage at him in 1874; its enthusiasm over Cleveland in 1892, contrasted with its angry denunciation of him in 1895, were cases clearly enough in point. In 1904, all Wall Street wore its Roosevelt campaign buttons; in 1907, it insisted that he had caused the panic and ought to be punished for it; in 1912, it talked of his candidacy as a disaster; yet in 1916, some of the typical representatives of Wall Street have been declaring for him in advance.

Perhaps the explanation for this last-mentioned somersault in opinion by the financial district, as well as for its present failure to become excited over the political situation, lies in the fact that the conflict in Europe has overshadowed domestic issues and events. The issues tentatively put forward thus far bear on their face their relation to foreign rather than domestic affairs. "Preparedness," "Americanism," "neutrality," contrast strangely with "the tariff," "the currency," and "Big Business."

FINANCIAL DIRECTORY

Of Interset to Local Investors

The annual tax on personal property in Greater New York for the past five years has averaged $18.56 per $1000. For 1916 it varies from $20.40 per $1000 in New York County to $21.30 per $1000 in Richmond County.

There are many well secured bonds which may be made permanently exempt from this tax by a payment of only $5.00 per $1000.

Our new pamphlet comprising a list of bonds which may be made exempt and excerpts from the present Secured Debt Tax Law will be mailed on request.

Knauth·Nachod & Kühne

Members New York Stock Exchange.

Equitable Building, New York.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

Butler, S. The Way of All Flesh. Introduction by William Lyon Phelps. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Greenberg, D. S. Murder. New York: The Hour Publisher.
Sologub, F. The Little Demon. New York: A. A. Knopf. $1.50 net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Alexander, H. B. The Mythology of All Races: North American. Vol. X. Boston: Marshall Jones Co.
Ambrogi, A. El Segundo Libro del Tropico. Privately printed.
Atlantic Classics: Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Co.
Baldwin, J. M. The Super-State and the "Eternal Values." Oxford University Press.
Bourne, E. A Study of Tibur. Wisconsin: Banta Publishing Co.
Cleveland, C. C. The Great Revival in the West. 1797-1805. University of Chicago Press. $1 net.
Jefferson, C. E. What the War is Teaching. Revell. $1 net.
Koren, J. Alcohol and Society. Holt. $1.25 net.
Loeb Classical Library: Ovid. Two volumes. Virgil. Plautus. Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. Plutarch's Lives. Vol. III. Putnam.
Macaulay, M. G. Lays and Ballads. Boston: Ginn. 30 cents.
Neill, A. S. A Dominie's Log. McBride. $1 net.
New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by J. A. H. Murray. Vol. X, Ti-Tz. Oxford University Press.
Parmelee, M. Poverty and Social Progress. Macmillan. $1.75 net.
Puller, E. Your Boy and His Training. Appleton. $1.50 net.
Smith, L. W. The Mechanism of English Style. Oxford University Press. $1 net.
Tassin, A. The Magazine in America. Dodd, Mead. $2 net.
The World Classics: English Critical Essays. English Prose. Oxford University Press.
Turner, C. H. Early Worcester MSS. Oxford University Press. 38s. net.
Webster, H. Rest Days. Macmillan.
Wells, J. E. A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. Yale University Press. $5 net.
Young, W. H. A Merry Banker in the Far East and South America. Lane. $1.50 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Miller, L. H. Bergson and Religion. Holt. $1.50 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Kearney, L. C. What Every Business Woman Should Know. Stokes. $1.60 net.
Young, A. N. The Single Tax Movement in the United States. Princeton Univ. Press. $1.50 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Benson, A. L. Inviting War to America. Huebsch. $1 net.
Crow, M. F. Lafayette. Macmillan. 50 cents net.
Fernau, H. Because I Am a German. Dutton. $1 net.
Freeman, W. Awake! U. S. A. Doran. $2 net.
Hamilton, E. The First Seven Divisions. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Henderson, E. F. A Short History of Germany. 2 vols. Macmillan. $3.50 net set.
Holmes, J. H. New Wars for Old. Dodd, Mead. $1.50 net.
Morgan, J. H. German Atrocities. Dutton. $1 net.
Patten, S. N. Culture and War. Huebsch. 60 cents net.
Simonds, F. H. They Shall Not Pass. Doubleday, Page. $1 net.
Trotter, W. Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War. Macmillan.
Ward, Mrs. H. England's Effort. Scribner. $1 net.
Wells, H. G. What is Coming? A European Forecast. Macmillan. $1.50.
Williams, W. Passed by the Censor. Dutton. $1.50 net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POETRY.

A Book of Princeton Verse, 1916. Edited by A. Noyes. Princeton University Press. $1.25 net.

Bailey, L. H. Wind and Weather. Scribner. $1 net.

SCIENCE.

Chamberlain, J. S. Organic Agricultural Chemistry. Macmillian. $1.60.

Christian, E. Eat and Be Well. New York: A. A. Knopf. $1 net.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

Townley, M. M. Two Plays. Boston: Badger. $1 net.

ART.

Bond, F. The Chancel of English Churches. Oxford Universtiy Press. 7s. 6d. net.

Fowler, H. N. A History of Sculpture. Macmillan. $2 net.

Ideal Homes in Garden Communities. A Book of House Plans. McBride. $1 net.

TEXTBOOKS.

Roux, L. A. Elementary French Reader. Macmillan. 50 cents net.

Wright, C. H. C. French Verse of the XVI Century. Heath. 70 cents.

John Koren's

Alcohol and Society

An interesting, dispassionate, authoritative discussion of the problem here and abroad, expanded from the *Atlantic* articles that have excited so much discussion.

271 pp. 12mo. $1.25 net

Henry Holt & Co. 34W.33dSt. New York

THE PROMISE OF COUNTRY LIFE

Descriptions, narrations without plot, and short stories, selected and edited for the use of college classes, by JAMES CLOYD BOWMAN, Professor in Iowa State College.

Cloth. xxii+303 pages. $1.00.

D. C. HEATH & CO., BOSTON, NEW YORK, CHICAGO

Studies in History, Economics and Public Law

Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.

Vol. 69, No. 2. THE BUTTER INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES: An Economic Study of Butter and Oleomargarine.

By EDWARD WIEST, Ph.D., Instructor in Economics, University of Vermont. 8vo. *Pp.* 264. *Paper Covers,* $2.00.*

***May also be had bound in cloth (with McFall's Railway Monopoly and Rate Regulation bound up with it),* $4.00*.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., Publishers

BINDER FOR THE NATION

To receive the current number in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with THE NATION stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents. Address The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

Ready Shortly

GOOD ENGLISH IN GOOD FORM

By DORA KNOWLTON RANOUS

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

Rossiter Johnson, Ph.D., LL.D.

16*mo.* $1.00 *net.*

A carefully prepared hand-book by an experienced editor and author. It has been planned to fill a real need in the daily work of business men, authors, and newspaper writers, and will, in fact, be found an invaluable book for ready reference.

"Whether one strives for correctness and elegance in writing letters, or advertisements, or lectures, or poems, or books, he will find a timely friend at his elbow if this book is on his desk."

THE AUTOMOBILE BOOK

A Practical Treatise on the Construction, Operation, and Care of Motor Cars Propelled by Gasoline Engines; with Full Explanations of All the Essential Parts

By JAMES E. HOMANS and CHARLES E. DURYEA

12*mo.* 4½x7½ *inches.* 350 *pages. Cloth Flexible.* 120 *Illustrations and Numerous Tables.* $1.50 *net, postpaid* $1.60.

MAKING HOME PROFITABLE

By KATE V. SAINT-MAUR

Author of "The Earth's Bounty."

Cloth. 12*mo. Illustrated.* $1.00 *net.*

The record of the experience of a woman who took a small farm near a large city and found a way to make it pay. It will prove an invaluable help to one who would gain a livelihood or increase a limited income by small farming.

STURGIS & WALTON COMPANY

31-33 East 27th Street. New York

On THE ART OF KEEPING FIT

GLADSTONE felled trees. Franklin trudged the country roads. Lincoln, Bismarck, Tolstoi — all had their own quaint methods of keeping body and mind fit for their work.

But what of the man of to-day—who has neither the time nor the wish to keep fit by such means? He toils by day and often long into the night. Social duties consume his leisure hours. Eventually his becomes a case of "nerves"—or of fatigue that sleep alone cannot dispel.

A chance to make good these overdrafts, a chance to replace the wasted tissues, and with that the means to revive flagging energies and quiet the jangling nerves—that is what his body wants.

And it is at this task of rebuilding and revitalizing, that Sanatogen has proved itself so efficient. Sanatogen is simply a natural, healthful food-tonic, with *proved* powers of increasing the efficiency of the nervous system, of aiding digestion and assimilation, of "toning up" the body in general. Composed of purest albumen and organic phosphorus, Sanatogen offers the system the very material—the building stones, as it were—wherewith to reconstruct, and in perfectly assimilable form.

Thousands of physicians use Sanatogen even in their own families. Letters from more than 21,000 physicians approving its use are on file at our offices. And there are letters also from prominent laymen, such as John Burroughs, Colonel Watterson, Sir Gilbert Parker, Ex-Sec'y of the Navy Chandler and a host of others, who know from their own experiences the help that Sanatogen gives.

So you may be certain that Sanatogen will indeed be helpful in the art of keeping *you* fit.

Sanatogen is sold by good druggists everywhere in three sizes, from $1.00 *up. Grand Prize, International Congress of Medicine, London,* 1913.

SANATOGEN

ENDORSED BY OVER 21,000 PHYSICIANS

Send for "The Art of Living"—a charming booklet by Richard Le Gallienne, the popular poet-author, touching on Sanatogen's kindly help and giving other interesting aids in the quest for contentment and better health. This book is free. Address: THE BAUER CHEMICAL COMPANY, 29-c Irving Place, New York, N. Y.

THE FOOD-TONIC APPROVED BY SCIENCE

The Gate of Asia

William Warfield

8°. 48 Full-page Illustrations. $2.50 *net.*

A fascinating account of adventurous travel through Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, Armenia, and the Persian province of Azerbaijan, the regions which form the connecting link between those civilizations on the west whose relations have been almost entirely with Europe and the Mediterranean and those on the east which are peculiarly Asiatic.

All Booksellers

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

New York London

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED